00027395

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY-1.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 25 June, 2016

CONSTITUTIONAL PROGRESS.

SEVEN LECTURES

B. 2918.

DELIVERED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

27395 ac

By MONTAGU BURROWS, M.A.,

CHICHELE PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1869.

The right of Translation is reserved.

00027395

LONDON: PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, DUKE STREET, STAMFORD STREET,
AND CHARING CROSS.

PREFACE.

THE following Lectures were prepared, in successive years, chiefly for Students in the Honours School of Law and Modern History. Most of them are attempts to give a compendious view of large subjects, which could not be treated as a whole in a Course of Terminal Lectures extending over only short historical periods. The popular form in which they were therefore necessarily cast has suggested to some who heard them that they might be found acceptable beyond the University.

If the Lectures are thought to touch too closely, or, at any rate, more than is usual from a Professorial Chair, on matters of present interest, it must be remembered that the nature of the subjects, living subjects as they are and pressing on the attention of every one, made it quite impossible to avoid all reference to modern events. It is hoped that such matters may not be found to have been treated in any unfair or controversial spirit. The Constitution of this Country is simply spoken of as it is, not as it might or ought to be. To regard with respect the system under which our Nation has become great and happy will not, it

is hoped, be considered a mark of Party. The Tex
books of the Oxford School take at least as muc
as this for granted, and a Professor can scarcely betra
his trust if he adopts their spirit, even though he ma
sometimes venture to criticize their defects.

The title of the book has been given, it will be see
rather as expressing the idea which runs more or le
through each Lecture than as describing any conne
tion between them.

To the two distinguished historians who have do
the writer the great kindness of examining the
Lectures and advising as to their publication, a
whose names he would gladly mention in this place
it were fair to make them in any degree responsib
for the work, the most hearty thanks of one of the
greatest admirers are justly due and willingly re
dered.

OXFORD, *April*, 1869.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

The Chief Architect of the English Constitution.

Qualities which make a Great King—The reasons why Edward I. has lost his proper title—Modern attempts to restore the true view of his reign—Edward's early life and conduct in the Civil War—Simon de Montfort—Edward and the Crusades—Edward's return, and the work he had to do—The theory of Annexation—The case of Wales—The "murder of the Bards" a libel—Edward as an Arbitrator—The Good Queen Eleanor—English view of the Scotch War—The Scotch view of the war—Edward's rights in Scotland—The question of homage—Pure legal view of the subject—Edward's heroic personal conduct—Wallace must be counted a hero—Edward's theory as to Scotland neither generous nor expedient—Edward's remarkable clemency—Edward and Robert Bruce—The French War—Results on the Constitution—Conduct of barons and clergy—Edward and the Papacy—Settlement of Church and State—The true position of the Crown—Sketch of previous Constitutional progress—Edward cements the fabric—His special work has remained—His composite character greatly due to foreign connections—Edward the medium between England and the Continent—General summary of Edward's claims to greatness—*Edward the Good* .. .. Page 1

LECTURE II.

Ancient and Modern Politics.

Taste for lessons of ancient history a mark of shallowness—Ancient Greece and Modern Europe; differences less than supposed—General Parallelism of the two sets of States—Early history and gradual development—Their great wars—The view of Thucydides—Athens and France—The ancient and modern "Allies"—Results of each democracy—Similarity of Party-Government in Athens and Great Britain—Parallelism of the careers of Pericles and William Pitt—Personal Resemblances—Pitt's conception of his work—Pericles' conception of his work—Their conduct as to their respective wars—Their similar fate—Defence of Pitt—The two Statesmen contrasted—Teaching of Athenian history on the subject of

Democracy—Ancient and modern Democracy—American De
cracy—Changes in the British Constitution—Necessity of pop
Education—Formation of public opinion—Athenian Party-Gov
ment—Mistakes of the party of resistance—Position of men o
party—Clubs, ancient and modern—Colonies, ancient and mo
—Democracy in relation to war—Picture of a perfect State—
progress only obtained by acting on true principles.. .. Pag

LECTURE III.

THE RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE HISTORICALLY CONSIDE

PART I.

Mr. Gladstone and Lord Macaulay—Conditions of the inquiry—
Early Church—The Emperors and the Church—Orthodoxy of
Eastern Empire—Eastern Nationality saved by the Churc
Church and State in Russia—Church and State in Wes
Europe—Connection with Rome—Formation of National Chur
—Roman Catholic Church and State—Swedish Church and S
—Early-English Church and State—Independence of the Sa
Church—Causes and results of Independence—Saxon spirit fin
victorious—The new phase of Church and State—Changes at
Norman Conquest—Meanings of the word "Church"—The Ec
siastical body assumes a wholly different position—Inherent w
ness of this position—The Conqueror's compact—Church Free
regulated—Church Freedom explained—Essential parts of Ch
Freedom—Church Freedom attacked by Popes—Effects of P
tyranny—The Edwardian Convocation—The Nation checke
premature Reformation—The Church was still free when
Reformation came .. ..

LECTURE IV.

THE RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE HISTORICALLY CONSIDE

PART II.

The Church after the Reformation is the same Church as before—
position of the Church—Henry the Eighth—Elizabethan settle
of the Supremacy—Church Freedom was retained—Ecclesias
Courts—Modern Court of Final Appeal—Convocation remained
same, but Constitutionally reformed—The Church reformed her
Services—Election of Bishops unchanged—History of this que
—Bishops in the Eastern Church—Bishops in the Western Ch
—Bishops in the Saxon Church—Election of Popes—War of Inv
tures—Compromise in favour of Popes—The Church as free as be
on the four cardinal points—Dangers of the new position—Les
taught by the "Great Rebellion"—The Church at the Rest

tion—Practical Suspension of Convocation—Church cramped by protection—Compact renewed at the Revolution—Convocation again suspended—Convocation restored—Wake and Atterbury—"Letter to a Convocation Man"—Convocation again suppressed through its internal struggles—Effects of stifling the Church's voice palpable in the Eighteenth century—England nearly revolutionized—New sense of the word "Church"—Reign of William the Fourth—The Constitution is changed—Demand for re-adjustment of the relations of Church and State—Increased Freedom of the State must bring increased Freedom of the Church .. .. Page 122

LECTURE V.

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE IMPERIAL AND NATIONAL PRINCIPLES, OR, THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE PAPACY.

The Progress of Civilized Man due to the conflict between two principles—Negative proof from Africa—Unity and Individualism—Pre-Roman and Roman Imperialism—Abiding power of Imperial ideas—Periods of later Imperialism—Feudalism and Nationality—Effects of Justinian's policy—Principle of Unity in the Church—Change coming over the Papacy—Nationalities formed—The Frank phase of Imperialism—Compact between Charles and the Popes—Civilization rallies round the representatives of Unity—Results of Charles' work, especially in Italy—Was Charles more French or German?—Each his heir in its turn—History of the Papacy shameful, yet overruled for good—Dawn of Italian Nationality—Germano-Italian Imperialism—Neither principle lost—Saxon, Franconian, and Suabian Emperors—France practically supersedes the Holy Roman Empire—The Emperors become merely German, the Popes mere Italian Princes—Growth of German and Italian States—Popes again ruin Italy—Shocking state of the Papacy—Slavery of Italy—The two Napoleons and the Papacy—Fall of the Papacy, rise of Italy—Augury of some great change—Why the schism was, perhaps, permitted—Intercommunion of National Churches was to supersede Papal supremacy 166

LECTURE VI.

THE NATIONAL CHARACTER OF THE OLD ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES.

German Universities contrasted with English—Antiquity and Nationality of Oxford and Cambridge—They form an integral part of English history—National by Royal Patronage—Struggles with citizens—Defence by means of Secessions—Principle of a Common Life—Constant battles, producing National results of importance—Effect of battles on Universities—Steps towards a reform—Edward III. prevents Secessions—"The Great Conflict" works a cure—Foundation of Colleges—Causes of decrease in numbers—Fame

of Colleges: Wicliff: Anti-French feeling: Insularity: National changes: rise of London—Patronage of Lancastrian House—Growth of Collegiate system—National in opposition to the Papacy—First to receive the "New Learning"—Wolsey—The Professoriate—The Reformation—Queen Elizabeth—Divinity: Law: Medicine—Laud—The Stuarts—Parliaments—Boyle Newton, Bentley, Locke—Share in National decay and rise—National, but not dependent—Constant proofs of their independence being recognized by the Nation—Property private—No "Paternal" rule—Close relation to the Church—Colleges founded for Parochial Clergy as opposed to Monastic—Merton, Oriel, Queen's, New, Lincoln, All Souls, Magdalen, Brasenose, &c.—Objects attested by Chaucer and proved by the result of the Reformation—Subsequent Church connection—Four cardinal characteristics—Modern marks of antiquity—Defence of English system—Present Church character—Reciprocal influence of Nation and Universities—Opinion of Americans .. .. Page 206

LECTURE VII.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE RELIGIOUS AND THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

English politics have always turned on religious questions — Three Periods; the First. The Second commences with Wicliff—The two species of reformers—The Third commences with Laud—"The Great Rebellion"—Party names given on a religious issue—Mistakes made at the Restoration—Reign of Charles II.—Struggle on the Exclusion Bill—The Fathers of Party-government—Causes of Errors of Church party—Its principles tested—The Nation at one with the Church—Junction of both political parties—Religious aspect of the Revolution—Hallam unfair on this question—Decay and renovation of religion—Church corporate action revives—Importance of Queen Anne's reign—Her alleged "bigotry" and "feebleness"—An "entirely English" Queen—"The Church in danger"—Rationale of the struggle—The Queen understands the cry—Real causes of the Peace of Utrecht—It was a deep National movement—Effect on Parties, and on the Hanoverian Succession—Religion and Politics for a time dissevered—The Hanoverian policy—Influence of Bolingbroke on George III.—The Nation returns to its old track—Struggle on the Test Acts—No Popery Riots: French Revolution—Difficulties of the Whigs—Renewed Life of the Church has brought renewed Life to the State—Warnings of History—Importance of the subject 255

CONSTITUTIONAL PROGRESS.

LECTURE I.

THE CHIEF ARCHITECT OF THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION.

OCTOBER 22, 1863.

M. DE MONTALEMBERT (in his 'Political Future of England') has lately said, that there are only six English sovereigns whose memory lives in the public mind of their people, and that these are—Alfred the Great, Edward the Confessor, Richard I., Edward III., Henry V., and Elizabeth. A foreigner's estimate is sometimes preferable to that of a native; but, if he is right, there must be a great fault in the way English history is taught. The weakest, the least English kings find themselves here along with two of the mightiest, and the mere fame of the warrior usurps the place due to the goodness and greatness of the statesman.

There are not many monarchs in European history who have been honoured with the appellation of "Great." Five only have been at all widely known by that title,—the Emperors Charles and Otho I., Alfred of England, Peter of Russia, and Frederick of Prussia.

Into the reasons why these alone have, and others have not, acquired the august title it is not the object

of this Lecture to enter. It will be found a very complicated inquiry. The title is always given by the generation which has witnessed the deeds of the sovereign. It is never successfully fastened on the memory of a man by a posterity which has learnt to discover the merits hidden from contemporaries. It is sometimes, so to speak, accidentally given, bestowed by a people dazzled with military glory, and very reluctantly admitted by those whose judgment is worth having. Yet in each of the cases above mentioned there is the common mark of a career coincident with the opening glories of a people or nation,—Charlemagne with Western Europe as a whole, Otho with Germany, Alfred with England, Peter with modern Russia, and Frederick with modern Prussia. They found, they initiate, they raise an obscure power into one which holds a leading place among nations. Succeeding monarchs cannot claim this position, for it is already occupied. The memory of a St. Louis must be perpetuated by a title of a different kind. The great qualities of the Suabian Fredericks fail to win the suffrages of Europe. A Henri Quatre has scarcely won it. A Louis Quatorze rather calls himself "the Great" than is hailed as such by the world. The title of a Napoleon is challenged from every quarter.

Of our English sovereigns since the Conquest one only has carried down to our day a reputation which amounts to greatness, though even she, our Queen Elizabeth, has missed the title; and modern exposure of her feminine weaknesses and unfeminine acts has rather weakened than strengthened her claim. Many strong-handed, able men present themselves along the glorious line; but the vices of some, the unpopularity of others, the mere warrior-character of not a few, the

troubles consequent upon disputed titles, or the weaknesses of a virtuous private character, have reduced the claimants to the title of "Great," as we of this age should view it, to a very small number. For we have learnt to understand by the attributes of a really great sovereign a union of great natural qualities with great skill in using them—a skill acquired by a steady discipline of the character. We require a power of discerning the true interests of his country, the devotion of a whole life to its service, a largeness and breadth of view, a noble object in his acts and an attainment of beneficial results, a sacrifice of luxurious ease, selfish indulgence, immediate advantages, popular applause. We look for private as well as public virtues, a religious character, a higher motive than mere duty to subjects. If, however, the most gifted and best-meaning prince is generally unsuccessful, if he fails to leave his mark behind him, if subsequent ages fail to set right what the prejudices of his own times may have obscured, he will scarcely make good his title to be called "the Great."

One such there is, unmentioned in the list we have just read, and, for the last century, little recognised by Englishmen, who towers, as we believe, not only above the Plantagenets, but above the whole series who have inherited the task of governing the mixed population which the Norman Conqueror formed. In him we shall observe all the marks of true greatness, and, if we require the seal of his contemporaries to the claim, we have only to consult them, and we find they freely gave it. His very faults are virtues in excess. He is not godlike, but he is certainly heroic, kingly, majestic. His work remains. From him English Nationality, English law, politics, and social life, took a fresh start. He is

the great architect of the English Constitution,* the first English king. He is the last in whom the various claims to true greatness indisputably meet.

To what causes must we attribute this modern difficulty of rising to the idea of the true greatness of Edward I.? Perhaps the plan of our modern histories has something to do with it. They hurry on,—not for want of materials,—too fast through mediæval times. They labour to be concise;—they become obscure. Events are separated from their context; military events, as in this reign notably, from civil; ecclesiastical from both. We fail to touch and handle the organised whole. For every reign, like a drama, has its unity; and the true way of preserving it is to follow the simpler plan of reciting the facts in their order. To save such a process from the dry unprofitableness of mere annals is the business of an historian.

But Edward I. suffers from this treatment little more than other mediæval sovereigns. His memory has its own peculiar wrongs. His varied career,—various as his age,—has led him directly across the path of several classes of writers. Each takes his revenge. His victory over Montfort and the Barons was a victory over the enthusiastic admirers of that faction. With them may be classed many writers on the English Constitution, such as Hallam, who fasten with tenacity on his acts of resistance to the popular demands of his time. His conquest of Wales and Scotland has been more than avenged by the success of Welsh and Scotch writers in blackening his memory. Hume led the way, and has been praised by Hallam for "exposing the true cha-

* Henry II. was its founder; if we may use such an expression as to what was founded many ages before.

racter of the reign." It is strange that so penetrating an eye should not have perceived that Hume was misled by Scotch prejudice, and that, in attacking so extravagantly the too favourable views of earlier writers, he had erred equally on the opposite side. Can we avoid the conclusion that some political bias has intervened? Those again who, like Lingard, are led away by an overpowering ecclesiastical bias, complain bitterly of the rough hand put forth by Edward on the Rome-governed clergy of his day. Each of these classes of writers has unhesitatingly absolved Edward on some point in which he is condemned by the others. When, therefore, they agree in condemning him for the possession of a particular sort of character and principles, we might, perhaps, be tempted, on a superficial view, to rely on that agreement. But we should be wrong. This special bias manifestly leads each class of writers to make out his own case; each has his idiosyncracy, and he wishes to justify it. It is convenient to accuse the obnoxious monarch of violence, unscrupulousness, and cruelty.

The variations in the estimate of Edward can only be paralleled by those which have attended the memory of Becket. Each was admired—Becket extravagantly—for some ages after his own times. The Reformation with one, the invasion of Scotch historians with the other, set the tide running in the opposite direction. In the last century and beginning of this, a microscopic eye would be required to find a good word given to Becket; while Hume, Henry, Dalrymple (Lord Hailes), Mackintosh, Scott, and Tytler (each of whom has been accepted as the historian of his day), between them murdered the fame of Edward. The third phase arrived with the second quarter of the present century, when a

general sifting of history became prevalent, and one after another, the judgments of the last age began to be attacked. The great Church movement of our own day sent forth the late Mr. Froude, Dr. Giles, and others, as the champions of Becket,—writers who, while they exposed the errors of the post-Reformation estimate, threw at the same time a halo of such absurdly ideal perfection around their idol, as showed that opinion was far enough from having settled down to its final level. Perhaps an indication of the advent of a fourth phase, an approach to the final level, may be found in the late works of Deans Milman and Hook, and of Canon Robertson. It can scarcely be held that the memory of Edward I. is as near the point of being justly appreciated. The views maintained upon his character are still too discordant. Little has been done as yet towards a due distribution of praise and blame. Lingard, Sharon Turner, and Palgrave, have indeed done much to clear his character on the Scotch and some other questions; their independent and truly English spirit has protected them from a slavish adherence to the Scotch view; and quite lately the memory of the great king has found a most vehement defender in the anonymous author of 'The Greatest of all the Plantagenets.' But though many fallacies are excellently exposed by this last-named author, the praise of Edward is far too reckless and indiscriminate, and has probably seriously interfered with a general reception of his views.* We shall

* An abstract of this Lecture, in the form of a criticism of the above book, was delivered by the Lecturer before the Oxford Architectural and Historical Society, and is printed in their Transactions for Trinity Term, 1864. Dean Hook, in his third volume of the 'Archbishops of Canterbury,' published in 1865, speaks of 'The

avail ourselves of his help, where we can, with gratitude; but it is impossible to avoid the conviction that a complete life of Edward I. is still a desideratum. A few of the salient points of that life will be sketched in this Lecture, in order to justify the foregoing remarks.

Let us take the three great military periods of Edward's career,—the Civil, the Welsh, and the Scotch wars,—and let us watch the equally furious literary battles waged in each case for and against his fame. The Constitutional questions of his reign arise out of the military events of it. And, first, let us regard him as he enters public life.

All accounts agree in presenting us with a very interesting picture of the youth of this Prince. From his mother, one of the four famous daughters of the Count of Provence who all became queens, seem to have come his more brilliant qualities. But his father, though a man of great weakness of character, transmitted to him the inestimable inheritance of sincere religious habits and domestic purity. The Prince came out of a virtuous home, and he repaid the debt. Many little incidents preserved by the chroniclers prove the deep affection which existed between him and his parents. There must have been something real at bottom to stand the

Greatest of all the Plantagenets' with respect, though he complains that it is the work of a lawyer who has taken a brief for a client; and it has evidently influenced the only history of Edward I.'s reign which has appeared since its publication (in the second volume of Mr. Pearson's 'History of the Early and Middle Ages of England,' 1867). That history is indeed on the whole so fair, and will probably do so much towards restoring the proper position of the reign, that the usefulness of publishing this Lecture may be questioned. Nevertheless, it contains an independent view, being delivered so long previously, and far from an identical one; and it claims to be the first attempt to utilize the efforts of the above-mentioned author.

test of witnessing a conduct so destructive of respect as that of Henry III. Yet almost from the first, and still more and more as he plays a more leading part, we find him applying himself to the task of supplying his father's deficiencies, concealing his faults, labouring in his cause, and bearing him, like another Anchises, out of the conflagration. There is no more beautiful picture in English history. The short exceptional period when he sided with the barons may well be justified.

While he was taking up the duty thus lying in his path, he was gaining the most thorough education prince ever had. Not only did he escape the usual fate of princes,—the smooth and easy life, the training of luxury and flattery, the absence of that efficient restraint and discipline which alone can temper vigorous natures into true metal, but he had the thorough training of positive adversity. He could hardly have remembered the time when his father's home had not been a scene of distress. Bickering and strife were familiar at Court. The ascendancy which the great qualities of Montfort obtained over his imagination must have been accompanied with a sense of bitter shame at the degradation of his own flesh and blood. There are many indications of the impression made upon his generous young mind by the treatment his parents had to undergo. Had it not been for his early and most happy marriage, it is hardly conceivable that he could have been saved from a hardening and souring of his temper for life. Probably, indeed, to this time may be traced some share in the formation of that severity of character which, with every deduction for the bias of historians, we cannot but observe showing itself as he drew towards the end of his career and difficulties thickened round him.

In judging of Edward's conduct in the Civil war, much will depend on the view we take of his great opponent. The memory of Montfort is, like that of Edward, a battle-ground. The ardent admirers of "Simon the Righteous," an increasing body, can find no fault in their idol, and of course, therefore, can find little room for the praises of Edward. But even though we should hold Edward to have been right in the main throughout this struggle, we need not, like Carte and the anonymous author above named, indiscriminately condemn Montfort.* Edward's conduct appears to have been very much like that of Hyde and Falkland under similar circumstances. Each engaged for a time, from a sense of duty, in the anti-royal cause. The Crown had put itself in the wrong, and must be resisted at whatever cost. Soon its opponents are in the wrong, and the Crown is in imminent danger. Those who do not mean that the monarchy shall be destroyed must rally round it. This is surely the true heroic course. There would have been more ground for the extravagant admiration of late bestowed on Montfort's memory had he stopped in his career when to stop would perhaps have been to sacrifice himself. He chose what was more natural, to go forward in his course, to make himself king in all but the name, to trample the royal princes in the dust, and with them one after another of those who had helped him in his ascent to power. His fame must follow his error. Not the praises of the satirical song-writers of the day—mostly, by-the-bye, ecclesiastics of those new Orders which he had patronized — not his pseudo-

* This headlong assault upon the memory of any person who opposed Edward throughout the whole course of his reign is the most faulty characteristic of "The Greatest of all the Plantagenets."

canonization by the people, not even his merit in summoning the Assembly of 1265, can avail to save his memory from reproach. Some portion of the modern eulogy is fairly deserved, but only as far as relates to the time when he was the fearless leader of a rightful resistance, when he was the friend of Grosseteste (who, it should be remembered, died long before the armed struggle), and before he had allowed himself to be carried away by the force of circumstances, and, we can hardly doubt, the hopes of a crown.

During this conflict Edward had become more than a consummate knight (Froissart calls him and Bruce the first knights in Europe of their times); he had learned from Montfort the highest generalship a feudal age admitted. He had also taken his part for life against the dictation of the English aristocracy. Yet he had at the same time learnt what were the wants, the motives, and the power of that aristocracy, and had studied the true relations of the different classes of Englishmen to one another. He had learnt, in short, at the age when alone such lessons can be learnt, the secrets of practical politics. It was a long and rigorous apprenticeship; but it was thus he gained that rare knowledge of which his conduct in after years often showed he had the possession,—how to resist as long as there was any hope of success, for fear that concessions, once wrested, might be turned into fatal precedents; how to concede so as to lose as little ground as possible, and preserve for his successors the prerogative without which monarchy in that age could not exist. It was the same in his civil and military policy. It became his special characteristic to prove his power first, to show his clemency afterwards. After this civil war, terrible and prolonged as

the convulsion had been, even Hume is obliged to admit that "no blood was shed on the scaffold; no attainders, except of the Montfort family, were carried into execution; the highest sum levied on the most obnoxious offenders exceeded not five years' rent of their estate." Well may it be asked—When was ever civil war so wisely, so mercifully concluded? No wonder he felt he could leave the country on the Seventh Crusade. No wonder, during the five years of his absence, all things remained as he had left them.

And this is the best answer to those who blame the Prince for deserting his father in his old age and leaving England so soon after the war. The result justified his sagacity. If, indeed, it was a fault to join in the war, it was most pardonable. We must judge the age rather than the Prince. If we are unable to disprove the folly, the superstition and the vice so loudly charged against these expeditions in modern times, if we have not learnt to balance such charges by considering the great political, and to some extent even the religious purpose they answered, and the effects which ensued on their cessation, we may at least remember that they stood in the place of modern wars and modern emigration "as issues for discharging the sores of the body politic." Edward carried off with him many of those who had learnt to be bad subjects at home, just as, by the Fifth Crusade, the country was eased of a strain it could ill bear during the minority of his father. He was also, it must be remembered, subject to strong pressure on the part of St. Louis, the greatest personage of the times, his own relative, and one whom we have reason to think he considered his model. The hero was now grown feeble,

and desirous of the support of his vigorous nephew. The position of England, though it had become more insular during the last two reigns, still subjected her princes to the responsibilities of European confederations. If ever a time was to be found for her future king to take his measure of Continental affairs, it was while his father and uncle (Richard) were yet alive. It was too much to expect such a man, on hearing of the death of his relatives, to return without striking a blow.

He returns, covered with glory,—returns at last. Never did any sovereign mount a throne to which the right had been more royally earned by the head, the hand, and the heart. Like Justinian, to whom the old law-writers of his time loved to compare him, he comes to his work at a mature age. He has long been the virtual king. Unlike Justinian, he had learned to connect practice with theory. Like Alfred after the Danish struggle, like St. Louis after his first Crusade, he could form plans for the organization of his country, and he could carry them out himself, as well as choose the right men to assist him. He was not to relinquish the foreign possessions he had inherited;—they were a sacred trust;—but his business was at home. Next to the great work of consolidating the laws, the government, and the police of his country, and of readjusting the connection between the still heaving elements of English society was to come the establishment on a proper footing of England's feudal relations with the peoples inhabiting the north and west of the island, relations which had grown up loosely, irregularly, and dangerously during the course of ages.

This brings us then to another of the vexed questions

of the reign, to what has been even lately called the "iniquitous enterprise against Wales."* Wales and Scotland, though so generally mixed up together in treating of Edward's reign, really stood on a very different footing towards England. We shall not find Edward's conduct equally free from blame in both instances.

The question involved was very much the same at bottom as that we know in this day by the name of Annexation. The admiration we entertain for a spirit of sturdy independence and ardent patriotism, the value of the inheritance of national deeds, the benefits produced by the rivalry of nations in arts and arms, the sympathy we feel for an ancient people and line of princes (where such is the case), above all, our love of justice, force us to scrutinize closely all pleas for annexation put forth by the stronger people. Add to this that our modern ideas are coloured by the European struggles which have gathered round small independent Continental states as they played, each in turn, their not unimportant part in the "balance of power." Those who observe that the course of events, in all parts of the world, is constantly bringing the subject before them are almost forced to look for some general principles which they may apply to cases as they emerge. It would, of course, be presumptuous to suppose that any cut-and-dried rules could be complete

* 'Annals of England,' vol. i., p. 337. This book has attained a just reputation. It is the more to be regretted that the compiler should be so singularly retrograde on these Welsh and Scotch wars. Carte in the last century, Lingard and Sharon Turner in this, had abundantly shown the true nature of the Welsh conquest, yet not only are no new facts alleged in this work, but the true character of some that are well known is suppressed; e.g., that David treacherously surprised Hawarden Castle in the midst of a profound peace.

enough for general acceptance, but some such considerations as the following will afford a broad outline.

If a bordering nation is not large enough to be really independent; if from its situation, or the nature of its population, or both combined, it is a constant source of weakness to the larger country and, consequently, of strength to that country's enemies, always taking advantage of favourable opportunities to avenge ancient wrongs, and necessitating the employment of a constant and burdensome force along its borders; still more, if it cannot govern its own subjects, who are always giving just cause of offence,—it may be held that under these circumstances it is the duty of the larger to absorb, if it can, the smaller country. The absence of any of these conditions establishes a weak point in the case of the conqueror. Whether under this formula the Continental powers, the United States of America, and we ourselves in India, have been justified in our several annexations it is not our place here to discuss; but it may certainly be said that it would apply in the case before us. Situated close to the very vitals of the kingdom, its gallant people animated by an inextinguishable, ancestral hatred of the Saxon and Norman races, torn to pieces by intestine factions, allied on every possible occasion with the elements of disorder in England, already reduced by the policy of Edward's predecessors to the limits of a large English county, even a St. Louis could hardly have failed to annex Wales. He would certainly have advised Edward's first steps.

Unlike the homage of Scotland, there was no dispute about the homage due from Wales. The obligation had been acknowledged and observed. Llewellyn, Prince

of Wales, had been the most active ally of Montfort and his party. He now refused homage. But there was no precipitate resort to force. The daughter of the Prince's old ally, Edward's deadly enemy, is indeed stopped on her way to marry her lover, and, as some writers forget to tell us, honourably entertained as the king's cousin. But she represented a party not yet by any means extinct. Ought this to be considered, as the author above quoted remarks, "unworthy of the great prince that Edward is usually represented?" Would it not rather have been the greatest imprudence to suffer the marriage of Eleanor de Montfort with one whose hostility was declared, or at least implied, in the most formal manner?

The necessary steps are taken. Wales is conquered, and the Prince condemned to a large fine, but only to be pardoned. He is to lose a part of his territory as a guarantee for peace, but much of it is returned. To this same Eleanor, Edward, at his own expense, marries him. Prince David is rewarded in the most lavish manner for his assistance, and Edward now naturally believes the Welsh difficulty at an end. It is obvious that he could have annexed the country at once, but he preferred to leave it under its native princes, shorn of power to do him further harm, and, as he hoped, conciliated.

It is, of course, easy to assert that the king now purposely made the new state of things unbearable. There seems to be no proof of the assertion. Some causes of complaint against the English would of course, and soon did, arise; but long before any remedy could be applied, a sudden and furious revolt is organized. Prince David,—he who, being an English subject, is the most

bound to Edward of the two princes, seizes the king's castle in the dead of night, and massacres many of the unsuspecting English borderers. Wales is once more in a flame; it resumes its chronic condition. Everything had been tried; absolute conquest alone remained. Llewellyn falls in a chance encounter. David, by the award of an English parliament, suffers the punishment of a traitor. No one can dispute the justice of the sentence. As for its barbarity, it is scarcely just to find fault with the system pursued six centuries ago, when it has only lately dropped out of our own practice. It would no doubt have been better if it had been commuted to beheading.

Here, however, justice stopped, and the work of conciliation began. The story of the murder of the bards rises to our minds. It ought to be no longer necessary to say that it is now admitted to be a pure fiction.* Yet even Dean Milman ('Latin Christianity,' vol. v. p. 33, second edition), to whom history owes so much, has repeated the groundless slander without remark. The fact is, that the Welsh bards disappeared very gradually under the English rule, and from various causes. This way of accounting for the fact is amongst the ingenious devices of a later age.

The result of this conquest fully justified Edward's policy. The Statute of Wales is a model for similar cases. Just as much of the old customs was retained

* See Lingard, Sharon Turner, even the 'Annals of England.' The prevalence of this error in the present day is really due to Gray's immortal poem. Plato excluded the poets from his Republic. How much more should they be excluded from the domain of history! On the other hand, for the usefulness of Shakspeare, as an historical commentary, see Professor Reed's 'Lectures on English History.'

as was not injurious; just as much of English law imposed as was necessary. A marked improvement takes place. It was not at once and for ever that Wales ceased to afford a training-ground for our princes in the art of war; but, as every one knows, the Principality has supplied for many centuries the most faithful subjects of the Crown. It is a case of annexation to which the descendants on either side may look back without shame.

On the period between the Welsh and Scotch expeditions it will be unnecessary to remark in this place except to point out how strong a proof of Edward's greatness being recognized abroad is afforded by his being chosen arbiter between the conflicting nations of Southern Europe.* This was almost a new thing. Scarcely, as yet, had even popes thus dealt with nations. Our Henry II. had indeed set a sort of precedent, but St. Louis had merely arbitrated between warring factions within a State.

We have now to deal with the still more vexed question of the Scotch wars. By the time the King commences this struggle he has arrived at his culminating point. More than half his reign has passed away. Successful in all his undertakings, his fame at its height at home and abroad, not yet forced into collision with his

* Edward did not go abroad merely on the business of this arbitration. His presence was required in Gascony, with which he had a peculiar personal connection and which had long been in a state of disorder. In that most interesting metrical French chronicle of Langtoft (an English contemporary), done into English verse, and so changed from a "Romance" into a "Geste," by Robert Brunne, the precursor of Gower and Chaucer, the state of Gascony is pithily put:—

"Thither behoved him nede to set that lond in pes.
For foles have no drede that long are justiceles."

people, his domestic happiness, since his accession, in the main unclouded, he had perhaps learnt to presume too much on his power and prosperity. At the very moment when he is called on to deal with the most serious question of his eventful life, his great affliction overtakes him. The wife of his early youth, the inseparable companion of all his wanderings, the mother of his fourteen children, dies. Few of our queens have left a more pleasing memory behind them than Eleanor of Castile. It has been suggested * that we may trace from the period of her death the commencement of a decadence in Edward's moral standard, a growing severity, and a less scrupulous reluctance to seize political advantages. It may be so. This second portion of the reign offers more difficulties than the first. Let us deal with them as best we may.

In the first place we have to recover the true history of these events from two entirely different sources, neither of which can in the nature of things be satisfactory. The English alone had at that period any

* By Sharon Turner. Walsingham says of her that she was "Mulier pia, modesta, misericors Anglicorum, amatrix omnium et velut columna regni totius." The public-spirited conduct of the Charing Cross Hotel Company in erecting their beautiful restoration of the Eleanor Cross has done something to revive a memory which should never be suffered to die.

The fine old story of her sucking the poison from her husband's wound has been looked for in vain in any writer earlier than a Spanish chronicler of nearly two centuries after the date of Eleanor. It can scarcely be supposed that such an anecdote would have escaped contemporary writers if it had been true, and it is now universally repudiated. It is scarcely possible that a private tradition should have lingered on in the Castilian home of the Queen without being known in England; yet it is just possible, and in itself the thing was probable enough.

chroniclers. Several of these are allowed to be trustworthy and well informed. But then they cannot avoid regarding Edward's transactions from an English point of view. Edward is the "*rex bonus*," "*magnificus rex*," "*le bon roi Edouard.*"* Wallace, or "Waleys," is nothing but "*latro publicus*" and "*proditor.*" His resistance to Edward is "*audacia presumptibilis.*" Bruce's murder of Comyn is simply an act of foul treachery and horrid sacrilege; he is called the "*pseudo-rex et pestifer coronatus.*" Edward is in the right through each act of the drama. How could it be otherwise? The English have never been wanting in national prejudice. It is not easy to find an account of the great war of the French Revolution which does justice to our enemies.

On the other hand, the Scotch, not being civilized enough at that time to have any chroniclers at all, and unwilling to accept the version of their enemies, have been obliged to trust entirely to tradition.† Everybody knows what stories of national exploits become in a barbarous age under the process of oral transmission. In the course of five or six generations Wallace, in the minstrelsy of Blind Harry, is a fabulous demigod. Even in the soberer pages of Fordun, the earliest Scotch chronicler, writing nearly a century after the death of

* Froissart uses this term to distinguish Edward I., as if it was his usual designation; while he calls his own patron, the great living hero of his imagination, only "le gentil et le preux roi." Elsewhere he speaks of Edward I. as "Moult preux, vaillant, sage, preudhomme, hardi, très entreprenant, et bien fortuné," &c. This testimony is even more valuable than if he had been strictly contemporary or English-born.

† The exposure of the difference of credit due to these sources is the chief merit of the 'Greatest of all the Plantagenets,' but the deductions are far too sweeping.

Edward, a connected account of the Scotch heroic age had grown up wholly at variance in important particulars with the contemporary English history. Bruce's memory is somewhat better cared for by Archdeacon Barbour, but his account is a poem (of considerable merit), not a history,—a professed eulogium for which he is pensioned, and written seventy years after the death of Edward. In these writers, and in Wyntoun, the English monarch is of course "*tyrannus*," "the tyrand;" his iniquities and cruelties disturb the whole globe; his conquest of Scotland is a series of frauds; he is "a destroyer of churches, an imprisoner of prelates, and the perpetrator of infinite ills." Wallace is a pure martyr,* "the lele man," Bruce the most faultless of all heroes, ancient or modern.

The Scotch were still further unfortunate (if truth is desirable) in their historians at the revival of literature. The accounts of their heroic age, thus transmitted, were not only accepted, but improved upon. They were an Iliad,—read, with less claim than Homer's, as literal history; and they have in this form, owing to the ability of the modern Scotch historians of both countries, as has been said, driven the English view of the reign out of the field. Still, imperfect, untrustworthy, prejudiced as the Scotch accounts of these events may be,

* The selection of distinguished martyrs with whom Wallace is associated by Blind Harry has some interest.

> "Rycht suth it is a martyr was Wallace,
> As Osan old, Edmund, Edward, and Thomas."

These are three early English kings, along with the great martyr of all, Thomas-à-Becket. Amongst the French the examples of the brutality of the English were Anselm, Thomas, and Edmund, the three archbishops who found refuge in France (*v.* Matthew Paris).

we cannot throw them aside. Tradition, though not history, has its value. There is always something at bottom even of its extravagances. Candour will at any rate admit that the same transactions may look wholly different from opposite points of view. Rapin,—who, though a Frenchman, set the example early in the last century of an improved style of English history,—hit the mark when he said of his own day, that "the English still consider Edward a great prince, who employed his arms only in maintaining the justice of his cause; the Scotch consider him a tyrant." The last portion of this judgment will probably never be reversed; it will be all that any one can expect if modern efforts succeed in re-establishing the former part.

The two questions of right and expediency must be kept distinct. The question of right depends on the vexed question of Scottish homage, one of the most complicated in history. Was the king of England lawful suzerain over Scotland, or was he not? Positive statements on this point must be received with as much caution in the present day as ever. So much has to be gathered by inference, so many important records are still wanting, so many interpolations have been made in ancient MSS., so undefined (often purposely) are, in many cases, the terms of homage, so unhistorical was the age in which the great controversy was brought to an issue, so mixed were the most rational claims with irrational, that it would be a very harsh judgment which would condemn either party for believing itself to be in the right, and load either side with opprobrious names for the part it took. The broad outline of the difficulty is visible enough to us now, but it was far from being easy for that age to trace even as much as that. It had

arisen out of the fact that the Scotch Lowlands had originally been an outlying part of England, and yet had now been for centuries the central governing part of Scotland. A dependence, readily enough acknowledged in Saxon times, grew to practical independence in Norman and Plantagenet reigns. Had it not been that the centre of gravity, so to speak, of the English dominions had been shifted Southwards by the Continental possessions of our kings, Scotland would probably have retained its original position; but, as it was, it was convenient to leave it alone, interference only taking place on occasion, and as quickly coming to an end. In a general way the suzerainty of England was admitted; but was it for lands held by kings of Scotland in England, or was it the old claim of the larger country for Scotch dominions of which it had made the grants or received the lordship in early times? The Scotch kings, in the century preceding these transactions, either rendered an indefinite homage, or assumed the former view of its meaning; the English insisted that it always meant the latter kind of homage. When Richard I. sold for money, to equip his crusading force, the absolute homage his father had acquired by the capture of William the Lion, the charter expressly reserved whatever homage had been performed previously to that capture. Thus, Edward and his barons, in their letter to the Pope, omit to mention the relations of William the Lion to the English crown. Things had resumed their old position, and that position was, as they held, indisputably in favour of the English.

It seems then there was enough right on the English side to justify an English king in believing that, whenever the time should come for the question to be put

beyond a doubt, it was his business to settle it. On the other hand, the Scotch might fairly claim to be considered patriots for not permitting themselves to be deprived of one particle of the rights they had learnt to believe they had inherited.*

But admitting that Edward did not exceed what he might fairly consider his right in asserting his suzerainty, a wonderful concurrence of favourable events having opened his way, we shall still have to decide whether his subsequent steps were equally right, then whether they were generous, and finally whether he was justified on the lowest grounds of political wisdom or expediency. It is not always expedient to assert even undoubted rights.

Now each of the steps taken by Edward after he had accepted the feudal suzerainty into the admission of which the disputed succession to the Scottish throne had forced all parties, will be found to partake of the same character. There is not one of them which may not be defended by the strict reasoning which commended itself to his legal, feudal mind. His motto was—*Serva pactum.* He would keep his part of the engagement; let everyone else keep his, or take the consequences. If the rival claimants found it their interest to swear fealty to him he was to be a real suzerain. It was no longer a doubtful and nominal acknowledgment. It was to be modelled afresh on the same footing as that on which he himself held Gascony of the King of France.

* The facts about the original connection between England and Scotland have been lately very concisely put by Mr. Freeman in vol. i. of his 'History of the Norman Conquest.' All that bears upon the English view of the homage-question since the Conquest will be found in Lingard. The Scotch view has been lately forcibly put by E. W. Robertson in his 'Scotland under her Early Kings.'

Appeals were to be received from subjects. If the king resisted, he must be coerced. If he defied his lord, his kingdom must be seized. If, when conquered, the conquered barons broke the oath of fealty they had taken, they were to be treated according to their deserts. All remission of their punishment was so much mercy and grace on the king's part.

All this followed with the regularity of a pre-arrangement. Scotland trod in the steps of Wales, though with a different final result. The appeals from the vassal-king take place. The complaints of vexatious interference are made. The vassal revolts. His kingdom is seized. (It should be remembered for what it is worth in Edward's favour that Balliol, when he finally renounced his crown, denied the truth of all the statements he had formerly made as to the grounds of his revolt.)* Rebellion after rebellion is crushed. He would not sit still and have it done by deputy. Never did general less spare himself. His own personal acts of daring followed thick upon one another. From first to last his personal heroism is the astonishment of the world. There was no faltering as to right when the step was once taken. France might interpose at the critical moment; he would withdraw for a space till the obstacle was removed, and return to his work with redoubled energy. His barons and clergy might refuse him supplies, his people murmur at the taxes; he would crush one, conciliate another, throw himself on the generosity of a third; the work must be done. The Papacy with a last dying effort might check him in mid career; it was but for a moment. There is no more remarkable instance in the world's

* Trivet.

history of perseverance under accumulated difficulties, —except indeed, the resistance of Scotland itself.

Rightly Scotland glories in the deeds of her heroes. Rightly she erects a monument to Wallace on the scene of his exploits. Rightly she treasures up the traditions which haunt each spot he made famous. For, strip off, if we will, all the romance with which a fond nation has clothed his name; reduce his effective work to the modest limit of two years' service; allow all that can be said on the barbarities he practised; admit even that Edward was justified in dooming him to the traitor's death (which is to stretch feudal legality to the furthest limit), and the fact remains. He alone, a simple gentleman, never despaired of his country. To the events of his single life, and still more of his death, may be traced the independence of Scotland. The private life of a soldier and outlaw must not be criticised too closely, except to refute extravagant eulogium. The barbarous cruelty of his raids may fairly be put down to the habits of the people, rather than to himself. Hemingford designates him as *latro publicus*, yet describes his efforts to protect the monks of Hexham and to punish his followers for sacrilege. The complaints of Scotch border barbarism are precisely the same when the troops are led by Malcolm Canmore, Saint David, and John Balliol. Wallace's merits are his own.*

In Edward's conduct towards Wallace may be observed exactly the same straining of legal principle as in the larger question. The sentence may be defended on the ground that all sub-vassals were bound by the

* See 'Henry of Huntingdon,' Book viii., for the barbarities of David's troops, and the letter of Edward and his Barons to the Pope (in Hemingford) for the account of the behaviour of those of Balliol.

oath of fealty taken by their lords. Yet there was something in his own proud plea that he had never himself acknowledged the English king. He had preferred outlawry. Scottish armies had acknowledged him as chief. He had commanded in a pitched battle against the mighty king himself. If his life were forfeit it should have been his life only. The hideous accessories of treason might have been spared. The best excuse for Edward's severity is that the punishment was really inflicted by the whole English nation, so exasperated had the people become with Wallace's mode of warfare and with the taxation he had brought upon the land.

And so with all. It would have been nobler to have abstained from pushing right to the furthest throughout. It was not generous to seize the opportunity of Scotland's weakness and to use for his own purposes, however much he may have believed those purposes to be right and expedient for both countries, the trust reposed in him. His clear perception of the benefits to be derived from union caused him to hurry on too fast. He was before his age. His success in Wales led him to apply his principles too rigorously; for the cases were not the same, and the same arguments did not apply. A peaceful solution of rival interests had been progressing through a whole century; the royal families were becoming so interwoven with one another that the union which was effected four centuries later seemed about to take place; the border districts had been, indeed, not unfrequently disturbed, but less and less often; no gradual encroachments by previous monarchs had paved the way for a final absorption, as in Wales; the distance of Scotland made its feudal relations of less practical importance; it was extensive enough for a

strong kingdom; its subjects were fairly under the restraint of their own government; the king had mistaken its real strength, which ought not to have been measured by its population, or the numbers it could bring into the field, for the nature of the country and the habits of its people doubled or trebled for military purposes, like the walls of a fortress, its actual numbers. From the time of the Romans to that of Cromwell, Scotland could always tire out her ponderous neighbour by adopting the tactics which Bruce shaped into a formula for his successors. And as to the possibility of retaining such a conquest, Edward's powerful mind told him truly that he was himself perfectly able to hold as well as conquer; but like some other not dissimilar monarchs, like Charlemagne in his imperial schemes, like William the Conqueror in establishing the new relations of Church and State, his foresight stopped short with the span of his own life. Not one of these three sagacious men appeared to foresee that the fabric he had raised could never be sustained, except by an arm equally strong with his own. Finally, it was too great a task for the decline of life. The result might have been different had the opportunity offered itself at an earlier period.

With the still further question whether, if Edward had ultimately succeeded, it would have been better or worse for Scotland, we have, strictly speaking, nothing to do. Such speculations are really out of place in history. We cannot view events from a sufficient height. We may be quite sure that everything has been for the best; and we may at least see that some good has resulted from this conspicuous failure. A nation conquered as Edward for a time conquered Scotland, would

never have ceased to cherish a sense of degradation and disgrace—a bad inheritance for any people. It was different with Wales. If anarchy and tyranny alternately affected Scotland, if her nobles grievously oppressed the classes below them, if her social and political development was more tardy than our own, she has escaped some of the civil convulsions and foreign wars of her neighbour. If four centuries of more or less hostility with England ensued upon her emancipation from Edward's yoke, some obvious compensations will suggest themselves. Looking to the advantage of both countries, we have not perhaps had too great a price to pay for the inestimable boon of a union based upon a footing of equality. What would we not all give that such a consummation had been possible in Ireland! The Scotchman, like the Castilian peasant, has the step and eye of a man who has inherited self-respect.

In our final estimate of Edward's Scotch policy, we may then perhaps observe that we do not so much learn the one great lesson of history, that what is not strictly right can never be expedient, as that even strict rights followed out to the very letter of the law are not in the long run consistent with expediency. But against the somewhat severe and unamiable aspect which the conqueror's character assumes in his general management of these affairs, we must in justice set the extraordinary clemency he showed in his particular acts. As in the settlement of England and Wales, so also in Scotland, the instances are innumerable. It is a "*system* of conciliation;" courage and clemency walk hand in hand. As a lecture cannot deal with details, it may be sufficient to state this in Dr. Lingard's words,—"The world has seen many conquerors," says he, speaking of this

Scotch struggle, "but it will be difficult to find one who, with such provocation, has displayed an equal degree of lenity." The extreme severity with which, in his final campaign, he treated Bruce's family and followers may be objected as an exception to this praise by those who are willing to admit it up to that point. But Bruce's position is very different from that of Wallace. Edward was dealing with one whose earlier acts will not bear inspection, and were condemned by the public opinion of his age. After Edward's death he displayed noble patriotism, prudence, and heroism. An indulgent critic may suffer this to atone for the selfishness, murder in cold blood, sacrilege, perjury, and treachery, which Edward punished, and felt he had a right to punish. From his point of view Bruce's followers could not but be regarded as traitors. The story of the cage in which he confined the Countess of Buchan loses its point as explained from the original document by Lord Hailes. Edward has also been much blamed for the massacre at the storming of Berwick, but there was the greatest provocation. The greatest of English generals could not, in our own times, prevent the atrocities of St. Sebastian. We must not demand that Edward should be too much in advance of a cruel age; we must measure all such acts by the position in which he had placed himself, and our judgment must take its hue from our opinion of that position. If a country is to be conquered,—and we have conceded that he had grounds for his policy,—there is but one rule, *parcere subjectis et debellare superbos.* Dante,* an impartial judge, distributes blame pretty evenly between the English and Scotch.

* 'Paradiso,' canto xix.

Edward's French war deserves a passing notice for three reasons. 1. The alliance formed for the first time between the Scotch and French on this occasion, and destined to last so long, has had its effect on the French estimate of Edward, and thus adds to our difficulties in forming a judgment. 2. The financial struggles of this reign, so intimately connected with our Constitutional progress, grew far more out of that than out of the Scotch war. 3. Even to the present day, writers (as the compiler of the 'Annals of England'*) are found who affect to consider the seizure of Gascony, by the villainous Philip the Fair, an excellent parallel to Edward's own conduct in Scotland and Wales. This is a pure blunder. Rapin, once for all, exposed the accounts of his own countrymen, which represented Philip's proceedings in this light. Since the publication of the original documents, it has been impossible to deny that Philip acted in this case even more iniquitously than in the other transactions of his reign.† No one doubts that he had a perfect right to call Edward to account. The charge against him is that he broke his solemn promise to restore the castles, the key of Gascony, which he had begged might be delivered up to him as a mere formality. Edward never disputed Philip's superiority over Gascony. He appeared by his deputy, and the citation was withdrawn. Yet, suddenly, by a trick of the grossest kind, forfeiture is declared. Of a war to recover his ancient rights, thus stolen as a man might steal a purse,

* Vol. i. pp. 337, 353.

† Langtoft's version of the affair is thoroughly English :—

"What did King Philip when all this was ent?
To Paris gan he skip and held his parlement;
And Charles his brother with him com he thither,
The Earl of Artous the t'other, three fals men togidere."

Edward is surely innocent, for his reign would have been eternally disgraced had he tamely submitted. And whatever we may think of his too easy confidence (or rather that of his brother) in Philip's honour, it is not the slightest of all the proofs we possess of his extraordinary political talents that, betrayed by his foreign allies, thwarted by his subjects, and with revolted Scotland as well as Wales on his hands, he was able to transmit his Continental inheritance to his successors unimpaired. Thus, as we are now to speak of the financial struggles of the reign, we must bear in mind that the king was not to blame for requiring such great supplies for the French war. The money must be obtained. He was responsible to Europe for his conduct.

The fact is, that England was now called upon to take a great part in Continental affairs for the first time since the new forces of the State had been called into active existence. The respective liabilities of the different orders of society for the public service had never yet been adjusted. The revenues of the Crown had never, since the commencement of the century, been placed on a proper footing.* England was undergoing a transition from the scarce-controlled Norman monarchy to the mixed form of government. It had to suffer many convulsive throes before it could finally settle down. But it does not seem at all necessary, in order to put Edward's position in a true light, that we should blacken the character of those who opposed his measures. Probably no one acted in the best possible way. It is easy for us to sit in judgment. But Bigod, Bohun and their

* See Carte on Henry III. for the low condition into which the revenues of the Crown had fallen.

party, acted substantially well. If Edward may be most fairly defended for preserving the rights of the Crown, which had been trampled in the dust during the miserable reign of his father, and supporting the honour of the realm so cruelly threatened, his subjects may as fairly be defended for maintaining the principle of self-taxation, so newly won, so manifestly destined to be the main lever of our national liberties. Where would this country have been had they not asserted this principle? So deep-seated must be the gratitude of every Englishman for the stand thus made at the most critical period of our Constitutional history, that we can scarcely avoid a lenient judgment, even though these men are justly chargeable with want of patriotism for their dogged obstruction of wars which lay at their door as much as at the King's. Winchilsey's conduct is far less defensible than that of the barons, yet even he deserves the gratitude of Englishmen.

And so with regard to the clergy as a body. The property of the Church was, it is admitted on all hands, at this time enormous. It contributed in nothing like a fair proportion toward the expenses of the State. The clergy were supporting out of their funds two masters, and of these the Pope got more than the king. The thirteenth century had witnessed the establishment of Papal spoliation to an extent which had been previously unheard of. The question had thus come to a point at which solution was absolutely necessary. Should the Pope be permitted to dictate in civil matters, or should he not? Were the clergy to be masters or subjects of the king? Was the spiritual power, in short, or the temporal power, to have the upper hand in the general policy of the realm? Nice, and yet most momentous

questions for a people to be called upon to settle; questions ever recurring, not yet laid asleep! Who can venture to pronounce a hasty condemnation of the leaders in such a struggle? Rather we may rejoice that men were willing to venture something in that day in defence of what they believed, and that, by the very force of the resistance of the opposite elements, a place for both has been preserved. For it was no truism then, as it seems to us now (though even Dean Milman, in his account of these transactions, curiously enough calls it a "bold yet tenable" principle), that those who would not contribute a fair share to the maintenance of the temporal power ought not to enjoy its protection. The clergy believed they were only asserting their ancient rights and their necessary independence when they said that they and the Pope were the judges of this "fair share." Edward, his barons, and, it may be said, the nation at large, thought differently.* His penetration convinced the King that the interference of the Papacy had become an anachronism. During times when scarcely any other check on royalty existed, it had, as the protector of religion, done its work. Its opposition to a William Rufus, a Henry I., a Henry II., had been beneficial. It had, even later, performed good political service to England. But its moral influence was gone. Its policy towards Frederick II. and our own Henry III., its growing secularity, the establishment of the Inqui-

* How entirely the barons of England shared the views of their king is shown by their celebrated letter to the Pope in 1301. "We came to this unanimous resolution, which, by God's assistance, we intend never to depart from: that our Sovereign Lord the King is by no means obliged to own the jurisdiction of your court, or submit to your Holiness's sentence with respect to his sovereignty over the kingdom of Scotland, or, indeed, in any other temporal matter."

sition, the Albigensian Crusade, the loss of Palestine, the assertion of (what was in later times called) the Gallican liberties, had assured so keen an observer as Edward that its anomalous and temporary position towards nations ought to come to an end. Kings, scarcely able to struggle against the developing powers within their own States, could no longer put up with a divided allegiance. The influences of the Common Law and the lawyers, the reviving Saxon spirit of independence, had prepared the nation. And thus, in true accordance with the wants of the age, was laid down for ever a principle which had been lost sight of since the humiliation of King John, and which was to lead ultimately to the Reformation. The Act of Præmunire, on which that great change was based, was merely a more definite legislation founded upon Edward's precedent.

The force, then, necessary to establish that the clergy were the King's subjects, not the Pope's, may appear, in its immediate exercise, severe and arbitrary; and it is easy to paint a disagreeable picture of it: but of all Edward's titles to admiration perhaps none in reality ranks higher. And let it be remembered that this was no godless Rufus or profligate John, no irreligious or indifferent king, with whom the clergy were struggling, but one who exhibited a noble example (not, indeed, without the imperfections of mortality) of moral excellence—admirable, all but faultless in his domestic relations through life—proverbially faithful to his word, deeply imbued with the religion in which he had been educated. Nor was this a prince whose wish was to make the clergy one whit less politically important than they had ever been. It is well known that it was not his fault that the clergy did not form an integral portion

of the new Parliament which took shape in his reign. The devolution of their function as an Estate of the Realm on their separate House of Convocation, when they might and ought to have taken their place in the Parliament itself, was entirely, by the confession of all, their own shortsighted policy. Instead of a National Synod for spiritual, and a Representation in Parliament for political purposes, they chose a Convocation which was defective under both aspects, though far better than nothing. Perhaps, however, even this remark borders upon useless speculation; for, after all, how can we tell, six hundred years after the event, what would have been really best or worst? Edward's memory at least is clear in the matter.

We must assuredly weigh these considerations before we allow ourselves to be carried away by the full tide of depreciation which meets us in modern authors when they speak of Edward's seizure of money, evasions of the Charters, oppression of the Church, and violence towards his subjects generally. No doubt something of all this sticks. We have no faultless prince before us. A love of power was scarcely separable from so vigorous a character, trained in such a school of restless action; but we must remember, also, that kings swore at their Coronation to maintain the rights of the Crown, as well as that the obligation of an oath extorted by force has always been deemed questionable, independently of the notion, peculiar to a corrupted form of Christianity, that the Pope had the power of dispensation. Magna Charta was always regarded by the early Plantagenets as a violent invasion of their rightful prerogative. Hence its numerous Confirmations. Each of these was a fresh display of force on the part of the subject. Each

made it more difficult for a king to recur to the previous state of things. In the course of four or five generations the prerogative of the subject (if we may use the term) was as well established as that of the Crown. The power of the purse had given to subjects what the power of the sword had given the Norman kings and their successors.

We are not then too exclusively to regard the long conflict as that of an injured people perseveringly extorting their rights from faithless and slippery princes. Some, at least, of those princes believed they were acting conscientiously. Rather, it was a long course of adjustment of the relations of the different classes of society to the sovereign and to one another, running parallel with that which was taking place on the Continent. Ever since the loss of Normandy (in 1204) the power of the Crown had been undergoing so rapid a decline that, by the middle of the century, government of any kind had become scarcely possible. The country was in much the same condition, constitutionally, as in the seventeenth century: old methods of government were passing away, and the new had not been developed. The Edwardian settlement holds a similar place with that of the Revolution, though the changes of the latter period were of far less importance. John and Henry III., happily for England, had ruined the old Norman position of English kings. The vast alienation of Crown lands which had been necessary to save the very existence of royalty in Henry III.'s minority, had made a gap which something else must fill up. There was imminent danger during this century of a Constitution being formed of a very different nature from that under which we have attained our present position,—one, as

men may think, better or worse, but certainly not the same. What would have been the issue of a struggle between a powerful nobility and a powerful clergy, with the Crown unable to hold the balance? What the condition of a Third Estate prematurely called into prominence as the ally of one or the other? Territorial redivisions of our scarcely yet consolidated England would probably have taken place; or, at best, some family raised to the throne less noble, less fitted for its post than the Plantagenet. Exactly such a chief as Edward seems at any rate to have been required for the times,—one who could command respect from the rude and turbulent for the now contemptible name of king, who could win the suffrages of the learned and politic by his sagacity and self-restraint, who could awe foreign sovereigns by his fame, and reign in the hearts of the virtuous and industrious by his care for their welfare, his domestic purity and his religious character. Hallam has remarked that public liberty might have been crushed in its infancy had an Edward succeeded John; but we find him nowhere admitting that, without an Edward, the due power of the Crown, quite as necessary for the nation as public liberty in that age, would probably have dropped altogether out of the Constitution. Panegyrics on our form of government lose much of their force when the successful efforts of those to whom one part of it is due are alone applauded.

How remarkably have each of the three kings whose reigns span that wonderful century fitted into the place required for our Constitutional progress! Without a John we might have failed to consecrate in our national infancy the right of resistance to tyranny. Without a Henry III. we might have failed to learn the art of

combination against the rule of foreigners, Papal interference, and ecclesiastical immunities. But without an Edward we could hardly have leaped, as it were, during the space of one generation, out of a chaos of conflict into the settled government, the united society, the nation powerful for peace and war which we were at his death. Had he not checked the too vigorous growth of clergy and barons, and fostered the growth of the middle classes, they could hardly have fallen into the places they have since held. It required a strong hand, a wise head. The barons were all but petty sovereigns when he came to the throne; the clergy had not yet learnt they were subjects; the Pope still claimed coequal government in the realm; the people had scarcely yet appeared, much less interfered, as a power. Before he dies, all are working harmoniously together.

But if these arguments fail to place Edward's conduct in any better light, if we still feel ourselves forced to regard him as a mere obstruction to the rising tide of liberty, let us at least remember to give him the credit, of which we have already said that he cannot be robbed, of knowing when to give way. It is here we perceive the likeness between him and Queen Elizabeth, the unlikeness between him and so many of our other princes. As soon as he perceives that the government can be carried on by the joint action of those who have united to oppose him, he frankly accepts and organizes the new state of things. He is reluctant to accept the Charter before means had been found for regular taxation; but he bends himself to the problem, and his work has remained, with no very great alterations, down to our own day.

We have occupied nearly all our time with the defensive portion of the question of Edward's greatness: we

said at the commencement why such a course was necessary. To develop the positive side of the subject would require another lecture. But it is in reality unnecessary, for the best histories are clear enough on this point, and a few very simple references are sufficient. It is only needful to remove the ignoble varnish of later ages, and the true lineaments of the original come forth of themselves. Let those who wish to be reminded of what he and his great lawyers did for English law observe in Blackstone, not only how every portion of Real Property law was affected by his reign, but see, in the concluding chapter of that great work, the testimony of the greatest lawyers to the value and importance of his legal settlements; or let them run their eye down the Statutes of his reign, and they will find them dealing with such a great variety of subjects as to show plainly how gigantic was the task which he accomplished. Let them turn to Prynne's Records, and they will be astonished at the magnitude of the body of precedents laid down in this reign for the adjustment of the relations between Church and State. Still more might his eulogist say of his settlement of our Representative system, as was said of Wren in St. Paul's, *Si monumentum requiris circumspice.* That the English Justinian had his Tribonian in the great Bishop Burnell, that the successful general was served by such an able soldier-prelate as Anthony Beck, that the opposition to his arbitrary finance forced the king into a Constitutional position, these things detract no whit from his glory. It is the man who can make, discover, and use instruments who deserves fame; the man who can organize for the future what was at the moment unmanageable.

Nor, again, will it really detract from Edward's

greatness if we connect his policy with that of his contemporaries. We shall never comprehend his life and conduct as a whole until we have grasped the condition of Christendom and of the human mind at this period. For this king is, if ever a king of England was, a member of the great European royal family, and brings with him a wider experience of European affairs than even the first Norman and first Plantagenet to whom England owed so much. His early residence in Gascony and his Castilian marriage, his five years' wanderings before his coronation, his three years subsequently spent abroad, and his expedition against France, fall naturally into the career of the nephew by marriage both of Frederick II.,—who, whatever else we may think of him, was certainly the most brilliant emperor of the German series,—and of the greatest king of the Capetian dynasty, Louis IX. His early youth must have been familiar with the story of the chequered career of the first; his early manhood was influenced by personal intercourse with the second.* Much, no doubt, of that remarkable union of the soldier, the statesman, and the devout Christian, which is to be found so rarely in history, though less rarely in that age than any other, was learnt by Edward from him of whom it has been said—

"Where shall the Holy Cross find rest?
On a crown'd monarch's mailed breast.
Like some bright angel o'er the darkling scene
Through court and camp he holds his heavenward course serene."

From these men he was learning his political lesson, and what a lesson it was! The world has never seen the

* Matthew Paris has more than one letter from Frederick II. to Henry III. The relations with St. Louis were intimate.

like.* How could he but have been influenced by it? From them he was learning to fill the place they vacated on the European stage, and to become like them, for all posterity, the most famous monarch of his nation. It is remarkable that one century should have witnessed the highest flight of royalty in the three greatest monarchies of the modern world.

It has now become a trite historical statement that the twelfth century was that in which the human mind exhibited the greatest activity, and made the most wonderful advances. The effect of this march of intellect upon politics was scarcely felt before the thirteenth century; and England, though far before the rest of her neighbours on some points, especially in the foundation laid for a Constitution, was somewhat behind in the intellectual race. She had yet to learn much from the Continent, and Edward I. was the great medium of transmission. In every department of government and of society he seems to have felt the European influences of that stirring age. His plans for the consolidation of the British Isles were identical with those with which he was familiar abroad. He was but adopting the policy which had for some time been partially pursued in France with the most marked success. The North French provinces—which, in his father's time, had scarcely been more French than Scotland English—were already so satisfied with their incorporation into the French monarchy, that they refused the well-intentioned proposals of St. Louis to restore them to their old masters. The process was going on in many other

* See Sismondi's estimate of St. Louis and the work of the last sixteen years of his reign ('Hist. des Français'): and Milman for Fred. II.

directions. As England was losing her position on the Continent, it seemed only the more necessary she should integrate her own island populations. The resemblance to St. Louis may further be remarked in the practical instinct which taught him to use the feudal system as he found it, for the purpose of carrying his schemes into execution.

Next, it was an age of lawyers and legislation. Frederick had been the great legislator of Italy, Louis of France. The "Establishments" of St. Louis was the great work of the age. Feudalism had now imbibed the full influences of Roman law, and required remodelling for the growing middle class. England was ripe for her Establishments also, and Edward with his lawyers gave them. In Edward's proceedings with the ecclesiastics we may plainly trace the hand of the lawyers, but St. Louis and Blanche had been as remarkable as Edward for the combination of devoted piety with a stern resolution to check ecclesiastical abuses.

It was the age of Representative governments. Castile and Aragon, countries with which Edward was well acquainted, had preceded England by a century and a half. Frederick II., a generation before Montfort sought that method of protecting himself against the Crown, had summoned representatives in Italy.* Louis had commenced the practice of summoning burghers in France. It was Edward's glory to lay the foundations of parliamentary government deeper and firmer than any. English Parliaments up to Edward's time had

* Yet Sir James Mackintosh believed that "Montfort was the instrument of disclosing to the world that great institution of representation which was to introduce into popular governments a regularity and order," &c.—'History of England,' vol. i. p. 238.

been like the rudimentary fossils, precursory to existing species, which we find in the earlier geological strata. From his reign we trace without a break what we still possess.

It was an age of Universities. Frederick in Italy, Blanche and Louis in France, had protected and developed them. Edward's reign is full of evidence that he considered this work to have a special claim upon him.

The age had taken up the correction of debased coinage.* Like St. Louis, Edward drove the foreign coin out of his kingdom, and cried down the base crocards and pollards of his day. In his careful development of commerce he had been preceded by Frederick and Louis. His treatment of the Jews has been harshly judged, but it was the will of the nation, and ran parallel with the Continental movement. The policy had a deeper seat in the commercial instincts of the day than is sometimes supposed. Europe had outgrown the need of so exclusive and offensive a body of capitalists, and Christians were now ready to take their place. Many other traces of sympathetic action between England and the Continent might be noted. Edward in every case improved on his model. England had the best of what the age produced. How much the social and political advance of the Continent would have affected England in the thirteenth century had it not been for him, no one can say; but through him mainly it came.

* On this point Brunne's Langtoft quaintly says:—

"Edward did smyte rounde peny, halfpeny, ferthyng,
The croice passed the bounde of alle thorghout the ryng;
The Kynge's side selle be the hede and his name written,
The croice side what cite it was in coined and smytten.
The powere man ne the preste the peny praises nothing,
Men gyf God the lest, the feffe him with a ferthyng."

Surely, then, this is not a king whose memory Englishmen can allow to fade. Let us sum up his claims to our admiration. Of great natural gifts, accompanied by the most splendid skill in using them, we find abundance. We have the beauty of person, the physical force*, the splendid knighthood, the unconquered generalship of a hero,—the foresight, patience, prudence, and mental activity of a great man, to a degree and in a combination very seldom found in any individual. Of the effect on his age enough has been said. No one questions his zeal for what he believed to be the welfare of his country, nor the largeness of the views he entertained of promoting her greatness and security. On no part of our social, military, ecclesiastical, and

* He was "*ab humeris et supra*" above the common height, "aspectu pulcher, magnæ staturæ et elegantis formæ" (Hemingford). Again Trivet tells us, he was "elegantis formæ, staturæ proceræ qua ab humero et supra communi populo præeminebat . . . frons lata, ceteraque facies pariliter disposita, eo excepto quod sinistri oculi palpebra demissior paterni aspectus similitudinem exprimebat; lingua blæsa, cui tamen efficax facundia." He also speaks of the "nervous vivacity" of his arms, the prominence of his chest, and the length of his legs, so that his seat on horseback was exceedingly firm. Hence his name Longshanks. Hume adds the epithet "smallness" to the length of his legs. I have not been able to find the authority for it. It is apparently a Scotch embellishment.

"Of the taking of Berwick Brunne's Langtoft speaks thus:—

> "What did then Sir Edward? pere he had none like
> Upon his steed bayard first he wan the dyke."

Might not Gibbon have added Edward to his very select list of heroes (only four in all history) who combined in a great degree the personal prowess of the soldier with the qualities of high generalship? Edward might at least rank with Pyrrhus and Henri Quatre, if he could not be placed with Alexander the Great and Belisarius. There are numerous records of his chivalrous feats of daring. Mr. Pearson calls him "brave almost to insanity."

political condition, has he failed to leave his impression. He is *fortis, et in seipso totus, teres atque rotundus.* Of him more than any other of our monarchs it may be said that all previous English history converges to his reign, and all that is subsequent diverges from it. Even those who find most fault with him sum up his character in words which express as much or more admiration than they bestow on any other of our monarchs. If they cannot agree upon a candidate for the first place, they seem to fix on him for the second, and this once in ancient story settled a question of pre-eminence. Of his private life we have also spoken. Where shall we find his equal in respect of domestic virtues? As to his motives, as far as man can judge, the chroniclers leave no doubt of his reaching the full standard, the high tone which we find now and then in the elevated personages of that age, of his being filled with the very essence of that lofty chivalry which was new-born from the crusading and religious element of late introduced into feudalism. If, as we have seen, there are stages of his career which betoken severity of character and a too great strictness in pursuing what he believed to be right, even though mixed up with innumerable acts of mercy and forgiveness, we may observe the same characteristic in each one of those whom mankind most fully agrees to honour—in a Charlemagne, an Alfred, and a St. Louis. It is the condition of establishing order in a rude age. What is wanted before all things is a "good peace." We are little able to imagine in these days of law and police what a mediæval society really was.

We compare him with those who, since Charlemagne and Alfred, have received or claimed the title of "great." How small do they appear! With our own Alfred alone

we shall find it safe to place him. Like him he was more a restorer and an adapter than an originator; like him he was trained in adversity and nursed in war. His life, like his, was one long devotion to the service of his country. Like him he was not ashamed to make religion, publicly and privately (though not in the same degree), the companion of his daily life; like him he was the first and ablest in doing that which he set his subjects to do. He has not the literary claim to our admiration possessed by Alfred; but, like him, he has left his mark on the country indelibly. He has not, like him, been saluted with the title of "the Great;" but he was called by the writers of the next generation "Edward the Good." It has been to our shame as a nation that we have been so careless of a Royal reputation, and that so little effort has been made to restore him his rights. Perhaps the time is at hand when a more enlightened public opinion will repair the omission.

LECTURE II.

ANCIENT AND MODERN POLITICS.

NOVEMBER 12, 1864.

THE text of one of De Tocqueville's greatest works is this: "A new science of politics is indispensable for a new world;" and the fulfilment of many of his predictions as to the course of events in the United States has gone far to strengthen the sense which has been generally entertained of his political sagacity. But such a sentence jars strangely on the ears of men who have been accustomed to deal with politics as a science of which they learn the rudiments in Plato and Aristotle, Thucydides and Tacitus, and who are accustomed to such interpreters as Thirlwall and Grote, Arnold and Coleridge, Niebuhr and Sir George Cornewall Lewis. There is, no doubt, a sense in which De Tocqueville's words are true, as we shall see further on; but, broadly stated, they are scarcely true. Indeed the converse is more correct. It may be asked whether there is anything in the science of politics which is really new. It may be said that the progress of society may require fresh rules and develop new phenomena, but that these phenomena have at least a remarkable resemblance to others which history has handed down to us, and these rules are little more than adaptations of the principles familiar to the earlier writers on politics.

We must not stop to inquire into the causes of the

modern distaste for the lessons of ancient history which has succeeded to what was once so fashionable. Perhaps it is not only that the vast accumulations of modern experience, and the necessity for generalizing results, have so completely occupied men's minds; but, possibly, they still remember with disgust the caricature of antiquity which marked the French Revolution, the bombastic harangues, the pedantic imitations, and the absurd nomenclature of that day;* perhaps they have not been led to look with favour on such trains of thought even by the visions of a Democratic Paradise which have been of late unfolded in Mr. Grote's Grecian history, though a candid judgment must admit that his brilliant pages, however one-sided, are a noble

* Coleridge has shown how useful a candid study of ancient history might have been to the men of that day. "If there be any antidote for modern restless craving for wonders and appetite for publicity, ... if any means for deriving resignation from general discontent, and building up a stedfast frame of hope . . . . that antidote must be sought for in the collation of the present with the past, in the habit of thoughtfully assimilating the events of our own age to those of the time before us." . . . . "I well remember that when the examples of former Jacobins, Julius Cæsar, Cromwell, &c., were adduced in France and England at the commencement of the French Consulate, it was rejected as pedantry and pedant's ignorance to fear a repetition of usurpation and military despotism at the close of the enlightened eighteenth century." . . . . "Even in the very dawn of the late tempestuous day, when the revolutions of Corcyra, the proscriptions of the reformers, Marius, Cæsar, &c., and the direful effects of the levelling tenets in the Peasants' War in Germany, were urged on the Convention and its vindicators, the Magi of the day, the true citizens of the world . . . . gave us set proofs that similar results were impossible, and that it was an insult to so philosophic an age, so enlightened a nation, to direct the public eye towards them as to lights of warning. Alas! like lights in the stern of a vessel, they illumined the path only that had been passed over."—*Lay Sermons.*

illustration of the principles which should guide the reading of all history, viz., that human nature is always identical, and that no lesson of the past is to be thrown away by those who are called upon to deal with the present. Surely no advance of modern science has affected, or can affect, these principles.* But it is one thing to write history in the spirit of a partisan; it is another to take the history of the past as we find it, stripped of all disguises, and to enquire where the principles of ancient politics have any affinities with our own. It would be a curious specimen of reaction if, in an age of educated thought, men were deliberately and persistently to insist on depriving themselves of what most truly constitutes education.†

Let us proceed then to limit our ground to the requirements of a lecture. Leaving the consideration of other phases of antiquity, let us turn our eyes to Greece. There are, obviously, peculiar reasons why we cannot neglect the lessons drawn from Grecian history. Nothing in the whole history of the world has in any degree answered to the condition of modern Europe like the confederation of Grecian States. Ancient Roman history may help us to trace by its light the rise of a particular modern nation; we may trace many resemblances between particular States in mediæval Italy and the larger ones of modern Europe; or we may, on the other hand, fairly call mediæval Venice the

* Thucydides, at any rate, assigns the probability of a recurrence of events as the reason for writing his history;—*τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ ἄνθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπειον τοιούτων καὶ παραπλησίων ἔσεσθαι.*—Thuc. I. 22.

† For many valuable remarks on the use to which ancient examples may be put by moderns, see 'Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics' by Sir G. C. Lewis.

Sparta, and Florence the Athens of Italy;* for it is true that the Italian States in their prime were the nearest reproduction of ancient Greece the world had then seen; but, taken as a whole, they were far too numerous, and in too fluctuating a condition, to admit of their being themselves considered in their turn as the prototypes of the state of things within our own observation. Mediæval Italy has been indeed the school from which modern Europe has received her teaching. The science of diplomacy, the rudiments of International Law, the refinements of politics, the common improvements of domestic life, the Fine Arts, and the forms of modern literature, have been in a great measure, as we all know, her gift; she has been to Europe what Greece was to Rome; through her hands has been passed on the torch which she received from the East. But, after all, the fact remains. The product of this Italian influence on the rest of Europe, as exhibited in our times, is but the reproduction of the type with which we are familiar in a much more ancient community; the features of long-buried political ancestors have most surely reappeared in their remote descendants. For a confederacy of entirely independent states, such as now exists in Europe,—looser indeed than that of Greece, but united by numerous common ties, and assisting one another's progress by their intercourse and rivalry,—we must ascend to another Europe, a Europe in miniature, but compensating for want of space by the intensity of its political life.† For the model of a self-governed

* Mr. Freeman has drawn out an interesting parallel of this sort in the Oxford and Cambridge Essays.

† "The cities of ancient Greece were cast in the happy mixture of union and independence which is repeated on a larger scale, but

people, with all the machinery such government requires, with all the brilliant consequences of rapid political development, with all the disasters which are sure to dog the steps of a too rapid development, for all the lessons, therefore, which are likely to be most useful for modern society, we must turn to the glowing pages of the great Greek authors.

Do men say that the lapse of so many ages creates insuperable difficulties with regard to such lessons? Perhaps they are smaller than is supposed. Christianity has leavened our institutions and softened our manners; but the acts of nations towards one another are really very much the same in principle as in the fifth century B.C. Politicians are guided by very much the same motives; the forces which bind society together are all but identical. Railways and steamers have not changed much, perhaps, besides the surface of things. New worlds have taken their place in East and West along with the old, but only to prove the unity of the human race. Men communicate their ideas by the newspaper and the cheap press, but it may be questioned if the number of those who have an intelligent notion of politics is larger in proportion to the mass than in some of the old Grecian States. It is probable that in every Christian country, in spite of an occasional retrogression, a real progress is going on, and it is certain that each development of civilization

in a looser form, by the nations of modern Europe: the union of language, religion, and manners, which renders them the spectators and judges of each other's merit: the independence of government and interest which asserts their separate freedom, and excites them to strive for pre-eminence in the career of glory."—Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall,' c. 53.

commences from a higher level than its predecessor; but it is also possible to adopt a method of speaking about modern progress which is not very far removed from cant. The course of events is only too constantly and relentlessly exposing those glorifications of modern civilization with which we are so familiar. In short, while it would be vain to bring forward the examples of antiquity, if it were not possible to promote progress by so doing, it would be useless unless the elementary conditions of the society in which we live were substantially the same.*

But it is not only the general resemblance of the relative position of the two sets of States to one another that has attracted the attention of so many writers. It is that both ancient Greece and modern Europe seem to have arrived at much the same stage of political life when an event happened of equally overpowering importance in each case. Of course much depends on taking an accurate estimate of such political position, and it must be admitted that to suppose every State must necessarily go through a similar process of rise,

* On this whole subject of using the experience of past history, see 'An Inaugural Lecture' by the late lamented Dr. Shirley, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. It is full of warnings against a slavish use of parallels and the mistake of forgetting that the progress of mankind is rather that of the growth of organic life than a recurrence of cycles of similar events. At first sight some of the points so well drawn out in his Lecture (which preceded the one here given by a few days) might be supposed to lead to a different conclusion from that adopted in the text; but the Lecturer has the satisfaction of recollecting how positively Dr. Shirley disclaimed that notion, and professed his agreement with the qualified and guarded use of ancient political lessons which it has here been attempted to set forth. His remarks were meant indeed to apply to some of the very errors which are exposed in this place.

culmination and decay, is a somewhat arbitrary assumption. All that can be said is that something of the sort is discernible in the history of every State with which we are acquainted, and that it is natural to expect the future to be very like the past. The period of the Peloponnesian War and that of the French Revolution have been, then, regarded as those of a very similar political and intellectual development, and to have been followed by a somewhat similar change both in Greece and Europe; while the war in each case affected the whole series of States, overtaking each of them in different stages of political existence, but shaping the subsequent course of all, breaking up the fountains of society, opening up new modes of thought, leaving marks upon the language, affording magnificent examples of military and naval glory.

The previous career of both sets of States has had so much in common, that men might be pardoned if they worked out various points of parallelism only too far. In their very infancy, their formation, we have the same phenomenon,—that mixture of races which is the parent of all vigorous nationality, the conquest of a weaker and more civilized by a ruder and stronger people. The Achæan and Dorian conquests of the Pelasgians represented very faithfully that marriage of the masculine with the feminine elements of society which was witnessed, so many centuries later, when the barbarians formed the modern States of Europe by their conquest of the Roman provinces. The immediate product of that mixture of peoples was remarkably similar, for it was the very form which mediæval Europe presented, a Feudal System,* rudely but securely

* See Mr. Gladstone's 'Homer,' *passim*.

binding together the scattered fragments of society. Then in each case, when that feudal system has done its work, we have a common enterprise of all the States, a Siege of Troy, a Crusading Exodus, using up and getting rid of the superabundant product of the military system, bringing those separate polities into a sort of confederation, and enlarging and enriching the common stock of ideas and institutions. Then, a common enemy, the Persian of old, the Turk of the Middle Ages, ever forcing by necessity a certain harmony on selfish and discordant members of the confederation;—common losses, common victories, each doing its appointed work in solidifying the whole;—a common book of reference, historical, moral, religious, political,—for Homer was the Bible of the Greeks;*—a struggle for pre-eminence among the States in colonization and commerce, the formation in each case of somewhat different types of political government in different States, but with a general resemblance to one another which wholly distinguishes them from other communities. In the course of time, as the States in each case develop their individuality and act with a more organized State force, while at the same time the common enemy ceases to be formidable, frequent wars take place with one another. Then, when the excitement of these national contests had somewhat begun to subside, and they had done their work in forming an International Law, when the most vigorous national life was showing itself within the bosom of each State, we have the emergence of one member of the confederation into such a position of pre-eminence, with a development of such a boundless ambition, and a form of

* See Mr. Gladstone's 'Homer,' *passim*.

political government within that State which so affected the peace of its neighbours, offending each in the place where it was most susceptible of affront and alive to danger, that a general league was found necessary in order to reduce the offender to its ancient position. This war is in each case a war of opinion as much as a war of self-preservation, and lasting for more than twenty years, though at the beginning expected to be but a short war,* broken indeed by a hollow and delusive peace which was scarcely distinguishable from war. In each case the offender develops a desperate energy which no one could have the least foreseen, and which makes it a match for all its foes combined. In each case alike the quarrel becomes internecine, develops new types of commanders, and demands unheard-of sacrifices. There is nothing which is not drawn within its vortex; and it is only concluded by the complete overthrow of the State which had been the original cause of the war.

Such has been the parallelism, though never perhaps fully drawn out, which has coloured consciously or unconsciously the writings of so many authors. Historians of Greece professedly direct their remarks to the modern history while they are recounting the ancient. Mr. Mitford set the example on a great scale. His history—which, with many obvious faults, was a great advance for its day—showed a very decided Tory hue in every line. Bishop Thirlwall was far from copying Mr. Mitford. His calm and philosophical pages may be said to represent the Whig view of the period; while

* Burke stood almost alone in his prediction that the war which he had so great a share in exciting his countrymen to undertake would be a long war.

Mr. Grote has lately recast the whole subject on a still grander scale, and on the principles of the most "advanced" political school. It is because this last remarkable work has for the moment so nearly superseded all others that it is well to remind ourselves that he has not superseded the contemporary historians themselves, and that if we want to make full use of the lessons of those times, we shall do well to take what such a writer as Thucydides tells us without following too closely any party interpreters.

The very sketch given above, concise to the utmost degree as it is, involves an appeal from Mr. Grote to Thucydides himself. Dazzled by the blaze of glowing eulogy which the modern writer has heaped upon the Constitution and early successes of Athens, we might be in danger of forgetting the deliberate judgment of one who knew them well, and whose opinions cannot be put aside. All that we can attempt here is to recall the facts of that deliberate judgment, protesting against the attempt to overthrow it. From *him* it is that we learn what was the true cause of this typical Peloponnesian war, viz., the just and natural dread entertained of the power which Athens had long been so busily engaged in acquiring. *He* points significantly to the iniquitous seizure of the treasure which had been confided to her as the trustee for the rest of Greece. *He* gives a faithful picture of the arrogance with which she treated both her allies and her enemies. From *him* we discover the ubiquitous presence of that proselytising spirit which made all non-democratic governments insecure. From *him* we learn the true character of the demagogues whom, after the death of Pericles, the Athenian Constitution carried to the head

of affairs. From *him* we learn to perceive, and by him are distinctly taught, the impossibility of good order at home or success abroad in the long run where a State is governed by an unchecked Democracy. What avails the most elaborate attempt to shake our faith in these facts, and rob us of the lessons they convey? The more we study the other contemporary authors, the more we shall learn to trust this great writer; the more we perceive the touches of magnanimity and candour he incidentally displays, the less willing shall we be to entertain the suggestions of moderns as to the motives which might have swayed him in pronouncing his opinions.

We may defend the parallel which we have sketched still further. It might be objected that if the unjust and arbitrary assumption of power by Athens, under the pressure of a democratical government, and the drawing upon her in consequence of the whole force of the neighbouring States, is taken as a foreshadowing of the French Revolutionary War in its motives, its circumstances and its results, we find ourselves comparing an essentially naval with an essentially military power, a Constitution which had gradually worked itself out into a Democracy with one that started full-grown, a State of extremely small dimensions, which had appropriated to itself what was then a wide Empire, with one whose natural greatness was in itself considerable. But these are surely not vital points of difference. France had, besides the temporary similarity above noticed, many inherent elements which served to identify her with Athens. She had long given the tone to European fashion. Her language was as much the polite language of other nations as the Attic amongst

Hellenes. Her leading place in European politics, the ability of her writers, the cleverness, restlessness, love of glory, and vivacity of her people, the elegance of her capital, and the extent to which at least the external polish of civilization had penetrated her society —all this and much more might be brought forward on the other side.

So with the enemies of France. While she is taken to represent the Ionic type, to which her large share of the old Roman and Celtic elements corresponds,* the Teutonic and Sclavonic nations are taken to represent the Dorian. The monarchical and aristocratic governments of these nations, the fear, horror, and indignation with which, penetrated by the influence of traditions of innate superiority, they beheld the triumphant outburst of Republican fervour, the slowness of their movements, their adherence to routine, the haughty awkwardness of their early attempts at coercion, not unmixed with reprehensible motives and selfish acts, the tenacity with which they pursued their object in spite of the most galling defeats and the extraordinary difficulties of keeping the confederation together, the constant employment, till taught by disaster, of incompetent officers,—all this marks off a resemblance to the history of the Peloponnesian war which will be most clearly appreciated by those who are most familiar with both periods of history. The parallel might even be carried into the prominent persons and minuter circumstances of the two wars with almost as marked a resemblance, but it will be

* This Celto-Roman basis of French nationality presents more than an analogy to Attic Pelasgianism. It might be called an ethnological affinity.

more in place to refer to the spirit in which each contest was carried on.

Of course no one who defended this parallel would expect any one to agree with him if he suggested that all the good was to be found on one side, all the bad on the other. The courage which rose superior to defeat was to be found on both sides in both periods. They were wars of giants. But where do we see the true fruits of Athenian democracy? Is it in Pericles, Nicias, or Socrates, who may be said to have been its victims; or in Cleon, Alcibiades, the Thirty Tyrants, and the Sophists? Has Mr. Grote really reversed the judgment which we form of the demagogues and corrupt teachers of the period from the philosophers, historians, and poets of their own time? We may be pardoned for doubting it. Or where shall we look for the characteristic fruits of the French democracy? In the virtues of the Girondistes and valour of the Vendéans, or in the "liberty and equality" of a Robespierre and the sanguinary dictatorship of a Napoleon? Englishmen have not yet forgotten what was burnt into the national mind of the last generation. There is certainly something to be said in favour of the view which traces a similarity between the fruits of Democracy in the two periods, and observes in the conduct of the confederacies against Athens and France a high-minded protest similarly made against the infringements of moral and religious sanctions.

Thus much by way of attempt to weaken the impression too generally entertained that we are so far removed from ancient times that any arguments deduced from their politics must be of little value. We

may differ as to the precise analogies of different histories, and no one would dream of pressing them too far;—analogies, like metaphors, will never run upon four legs; but some sort of repetition of events arising out of similar combinations at the two periods will at least be admitted to have taken place.

Let us consider the Grecian history of this period under another aspect. Let us inquire whether the internal development of Athenian politics does not offer some sort of parallelism to our own. Great Britain was in the aristocratic stage of her Constitution when she led the alliance against France: while that country had suddenly leaped to the highest pitch of Athenian development. Since that time our own country has passed through many changes, some marked and rapid, some slow and, during their operation, scarcely perceptible. Our population at the end of the last century was only half what it is now. King, Lords and Commons, represented but a curiously checked and tempered aristocracy. But now, though we retain the old forms, the democratic element has assumed a wholly different position, and the Athens of Thucydides may be fertile in examples which may be full of instruction to the England of to-day. How like a page of English political life is the history of Athenian party warfare! How little have we to change beyond the names and the language!

Nor is it wonderful that it should be so. All really self-governed States must exhibit the common feature of Party-government. The process by which such government is formed must be the same in all. When the tyrannies and oligarchies and aristocracies under which society has gained its consistency have made way

for popular government, parties fall into their places. The old depositaries of power do not give way without a struggle. Family influence, education, and wealth, have a great tendency to hold their own. But a *ναυτικὸς ὄχλος*, or a manufacturing and mechanic population, increases and multiplies. It finds leaders. It insists (very naturally) on being represented. The new interests press on; the old resist. Parties fall as naturally into a Conservative and an Innovating party in the fifth century B.C. as in the nineteenth century A.D. They exhibit the same types, the same shades of difference, adopt the same rules. It requires but a moderate knowledge of the subject to enable us to detect at Athens the presence, for example, of the older statesman never ceasing to regret every change, however slight, in the Constitution or foreign policy of the State, for ever wishing to bring back even the abuses of ancient times, and attributing every disaster to some previous concession,—the political retrogressionist, in short. We find it easy to point out his direct opponent, the man who thinks everything indefensible in exact proportion to its antiquity, and every one equally fit to govern, be his stake in the country or his mental cultivation what it may,—the man of abstract right, the man of the present. We can discern the men who rejoiced in the removal of patent abuses, who made the best of such changes as had been inevitable, but resolved to make a stand upon what they thought the essential safeguards of their polity, and to preserve its balance by adjustments suited to their times. We can point to the politicians who habitually allowed their perception of the benefits to be derived from change (often very closely connected with benefits to themselves), to overpower

the sense they still entertained of the value of their institutions; and who are in effect found on the same side as the mere demagogue. We distinguish the high-minded politician and the selfish, corrupt trader in politics. We see parties sometimes divided on foreign politics alone, sometimes on domestic politics, sometimes on both. And while we find much which illustrates the usefulness of party government, we cannot but observe of course the grossest cases of abuse. What, in fact, we call "human nature" betrays itself at every turn, and enables us to read the history of our own party struggles in those of Athens. Scarcely a character presents itself before us without reminding us of some one who occupies or has occupied the very same place amongst ourselves.

It is obvious that this is not the place from which particular similarities should be verified by illustrations drawn from the leaders of our own day. Yet there is one which is irresistible, and of which the subject is just removed to a sufficient distance in the past to justify us in making the reference,—the parallel afforded by the careers of Pericles and William Pitt. It is true that in this case the exact coincidence of the political stages to which the States they respectively administered had attained is wanting. The Athens of Pericles is far ahead in the democratic race of the England of Pitt. But it may serve our present purpose to show how the accidents, so to speak, of party governments may throw up from time to time men of essentially the same type.* This is again scarcely a new parallelism; but the misrepre-

* "Practical examples are real models." Sir G. C. Lewis, in 'Methods of Observation' &c., vol. ii. p. 220.

sentations which have gradually gathered round both these statesmen, the false colouring which has been put upon their simplest acts by the industrious efforts of modern partisans, and the clearer light which is once more breaking upon the periods in which they lived, may excuse, perhaps, our dwelling on it for a few moments.

These great men have filled a much larger space than any others in the political history of their respective countries; the glory which they each acquired has inseparably connected itself with that of their own people; the periods which they illuminated (though, as we have seen, not corresponding to one another in Constitutional history), have been by common consent emphatically the golden age of each State. Their names have, therefore, notoriously become the battle-ground of party, the watchwords of opinion. Perhaps each year makes it more easy to place them in their true position.

Such points as the following will at least be admitted by all:—their appearance at a time when their States were in a condition to be virtually governed by the sagacity and eloquence of a single person, with no further right to govern them than that acquired by his own personal ascendancy; the fact that their respective States had been prepared by the predecessors of these men for a high standard, and had not yet been debased by the political deterioration of a succeeding age; and, in connection with this fact, the matchless superiority of the political education each had received, the one under Themistocles and Aristides, the other under Lord Chatham, Burke, and the galaxy of great men who flourished in the first period of George III.'s

reign; the extraordinary character of their eloquence, rivalled occasionally by their contemporaries, but outliving and eventually dwarfing them all; the position attained in each case quite as much by the incorruptible probity and unquestionable public spirit of the men as by their success in debate; the simplicity of life of each, standing out exceptionally in an age fast becoming luxurious and artificial; the wisdom each sought and found outside the sphere in which his public life was cast, the one from Anaxagoras and the philosophers of the day, the other from the great works of antiquity, but still more perhaps from intercourse with such men as Wilberforce; the unusual amount of foresight and sagacity each naturally possessed, and which each strengthened by a long career of public activity; the imperturbable calmness with which they met the surging sea of opposition which from time to time seemed about to overwhelm them; the very appearance and manner of the men, their haughty, defiant mien, their reserve and dignity; the fulness and completeness of the grasp with which they seized the subject in hand; the unwearied patience with which they devoted themselves to business; their very death in harness, devoting their latest energies to the service of their country. It is not too much to say that future historians will probably describe the government of Great Britain during Pitt's ministry by the very words, *mutatis mutandis*, in which Thucydides described the government of Greece in the time of Pericles—"It was called a Democracy, but it was in reality the rule of the first man." *

* ἐγίγνετο τε λόγῳ μὲν δημοκρατία, ἔργῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή.—Thuc. ii. 65.

It may be objected that one was the means of popularising his State, while the other ruled as the head of the party which resisted popular dictation; in other words, that one would in modern language be classed with Whigs, the other with Tories. Granted; but we shall see they had much more in common than is sometimes supposed. The way in which each used his marvellous ascendancy was remarkably similar, and certainly each worked on a similarly grand conception of the mission of his State.

Coming into power as Pitt did, when the struggle with our American colonies had just been brought to an end, and when the mistakes of his predecessors had dimmed the glory acquired in his father's time, it was his noble conception to make use of the opportunity in order to consolidate, to reform, to build up on a secure foundation the Constitution and the foreign relations of his country. How well he succeeded during that magnificent decade of his administration which has never been surpassed in our history is familiar to all; how he settled our Indian government, brought order into our finance, established commercial relations with France, supported the movement for abolishing the slave-trade, settled the great Constitutional question of the Regency, obtained, without prejudice to his own independence, the entire confidence of the last King who exercised the power of former dynasties, laid the foundations of that Union with Ireland which he lived to complete with his own hand, laid the equally secure foundations of a Reform of Parliament, and by the vigour of his diplomacy as well as his domestic government caused his country to be respected abroad to an extent which had never been experienced in modern

times, except under the influence of Cromwell and Marlborough,—all this is now beyond dispute.*

No less grand, though destined to be less advantageous to his State, was the conception of Pericles. Whether he perceived from the first that his countrymen had gone too far in their perilous policy at home and abroad to be turned out of their path, and so threw himself into the stream, resolved to lead them for their good and to gain such power as might enable him to restrain them in their furious career, or whether his position was only the result of circumstances, gradually influencing him as his political life proceeded, cannot now be ascertained. Perhaps in no other case has such an attempt so nearly succeeded: and yet it was all too late. While he lived, the monster he had fostered, or been obliged to foster, could, though with infinite difficulty, be guided; when he died, it could but rush to destruction. To raise his own State to supremacy, to render her safe from attack, to beautify her so that all might learn to look up to her with pride, to sow her institutions broadcast all around, to make her the eye, the model, the school of Greece, the soul of the universe, the awful personification of reason and strength, attracting all by love and wisdom and majesty, the natural barrier against Persian barbaric force, as well as against the vulgar arrogance of unen-

* The remarkable work of Von Sybel on the French Revolution has appeared in the English translation since this Lecture was delivered. In vol. ii. p. 252, there occurs much such an estimate of Pitt's conception as in the text:—"All these plans, the completion of which was to bring the epoch of 1688 to a close and open a new era for England, . . . were nipped in the bud by the approach of the revolution." He has some good remarks on the extreme reluctance of Pitt to enter into the war.

lightened Sparta—this, however little based on a true view of human affairs, and however it might involve very questionable means, was a noble conception; and before the gloomy shadows of the war, and the plague, and the ingratitude of his countrymen, closed around him, he could with perfect truth claim that it had been very largely realized.

But the points of comparison culminate in the relation these greatest of all party chiefs held to the greatest of the wars of their respective countries. Each was at the head of affairs, apparently almost supreme, when the time came that he must make the momentous election. Each has received his most abundant share of praise or blame for the election he made. It is remarkable that in each case the verdict of history, after the violent oscillations of years, seems to be identical. It is now understood that both the wars were inevitable, wholly beyond the power of either minister to prevent. True;—Pericles persuaded the Athenians to resist the demands of Sparta; but that is not the point. The steady tendency of the whole previous half-century had been towards war. It may be just to blame the minister for continuing and extending the policy which so unerringly led to this result; but it is undeniable that he did all in his power to preserve peace as long as it was compatible with the independence,—nay, the very existence of his State.

Nor was the French war less forced upon Pitt. It was the almost united act of the whole British community. This has been proved by Mr. Massey* and Lord Stanhope.† It is easy for us, speculating in our closets, to prove that it ought not to have been so. It

* 'Life of George III.,' c. 32, 33. † 'Life of Pitt.'

is indeed well we should treasure up our national experience; well that we should learn that it is not the place of this country to interfere in the internal affairs of our neighbours. Yet, though French Revolutions are no longer new to us, it is probable that if any such convulsion were to occur again, any such general rising of Europe in alarm at the aggressive policy of a Continental state, we should, with all our superior enlightenment, "drift" into precisely such a war as we waged with the French. But, in fact, it was not England that went to war with France, but France with England. Pitt resisted it to the utmost.*

The fate of these great men was similar. The war destroyed them both. Both received hard measure from their contemporaries, and Pitt has scarcely yet had justice done him. That he was not the great war-minister his father was, is certain. He was emphatically the minister of peace and progress. But his father was not tried as he was. We are apt to forget how perfectly new a thing in the European world was that extraordinary burst of Republican vigour. No one could have foreseen it, no one at first have successfully contended with it. The smallness of our army, and its

* The latest authority on this point may be given here from Von Sybel, who quotes the opinion of the man most capable of all to form one, Maret, the French (virtual) Foreign Minister:—"France might have preserved peace with England without any sacrifice if the French Government had not once for all desired war."—vol. ii. p. 312.

Again: "The French felt so strong an impulse within themselves to revolutionize the other nations of Europe, that they could not but presuppose an equally active hostility towards themselves on the part of the European governments." "The simple statement of the facts of German history in 1790 is sufficient to show the impossibility of such a league."—vol. i. pp. 223, 224.

rare employment on any large scale, has always subjected us to disaster at the beginning of a war. We required a long war to make efficient officers, and they were not ready to Pitt's hands. Nor is it fair to load him with the discredit of employing the royal princes in high commands. This also was the fashion of the day. Still less ought all credit to be refused to Pitt for the brilliant career of the navy during his administration. Lord Stanhope has well met the remarks of Macaulay on this head. No doubt much was due to the ability of our Admiralty; no doubt very much more was due to the preceding generation of British seamen who trained the men about to become so famous in our annals; but an enlightened candour will attribute the kindling of that chivalrous devotion to Pitt's own patriotic spirit, which found a speedier answer on the sea than on the shore. It was not till some time after Pitt's death, when the British navy had no longer an enemy, and the whole energies of the nation were directed towards the land service, that the old *régime* was swept away, and the one man who could match Napoleon forced to the head of the army. Till the Great Duke came upon the scene military matters had not emerged out of a chronic state of blunder, and perhaps could not have been brought into a satisfactory condition by any minister.

The charge most sustained against Pitt is his coercive system of domestic administration during the first years of the war. Yet, though these measures were so unpopular at the time, so open to ridicule, and in some cases proved to be unnecessarily severe, it is not easy to say that the volcanic elements of society would not have burst forth with fatal violence, had they not been

kept in check by the certainty that no half measures would be employed. It is certain that Wilberforce, who so often asserted his independence during this trying time, and whose amiable nature revolted at the least severity, vehemently supported Pitt on most of these occasions, and has left it as his deliberate opinion that we made "a temporary sacrifice by which the blessings of liberty might be transmitted to our children unimpaired," and that we were only throwing up "new bastions to defend the bulwarks of British liberty."* The difficulties into which Pitt was plunged by the war, the bitter cup he had to drink in foregoing his most cherished schemes, the contest with the very classes whom he was attempting gradually to raise to power, remind us by no feeble analogy of the enormous sacrifices of personal comfort which Pericles called upon his countrymen to make, of the misery they for a time involved, of the fierceness with which, in their agony of disappointment, the Athenians turned upon their great chief, and the humiliation which even his genius could not avert. The foresight with which Pericles obliged his countrymen to set aside a reserve fund for the future cannot fail to recall the famous measure of Mr. Pitt, which was analogous to it. That particular measure we are not indeed obliged to approve because we admire the sound principle which dictated it. On the reproductive power of his "sinking fund" he erred with nearly the whole of his countrymen; but if the principle of reducing the National Debt had taken the same place in the counsels of subsequent statesmen which it took with Pitt, it would have been well for Great Britain now.

* 'Life of Wilberforce,' by his Sons. In the new Edition, by the Bishop of Oxford, these passages will be found at pp. 140, 141.

On two points our great Minister was inferior to him whom we have ventured to call his prototype,—on one by the nature of the case, on the other by a defect of his own nature. The Athenian Constitution almost absolutely required capability of guiding an army as well as an assembly, and Pericles added to his other great qualities that of being a considerable general. Here Pitt cannot compete with him; but a careful study of his life offers many a proof that he would have eminently shone in that capacity, if circumstances had favoured him. Again, we have no trace in Mr. Pitt of that splendid patronage of the arts which distinguished Pericles above all the worthies of Greece. The cold, self-contained disposition, which would in any age or State have prevented him from becoming a demagogue, refused to allow the expansion of his faculties in one of the noblest fields within the reach of man. But it may be observed that this disposition had also something to do with one of his greatest virtues. It probably assisted largely in saving him from one form of immorality prevalent enough in his day;* and Pericles was certainly not above his own age, if he was not below it, in that respect! As for the charge against Pitt for the excesses of the table, it is now well understood to be far less heinous than it

* The share which Bishop Tomline had in the formation of Pitt's character has perhaps been too much overlooked. That he was narrow, self-interested, rather below than above the age in his worldly notions on Church matters, that he perhaps prevented Pitt from accepting a higher religious standard than he did, and that he made out of the best possible materials a very poor biography, may be admitted; but Pitt owed his tutor and friend much from his boyhood down to the day of his death. His moral purity and noble elevation of character were indeed his own glory, but they were also very much the result of Tomline's training.

was once the fashion with his detractors to assert. His medical advisers had trained him in the habit of drinking port wine in large quantities, and his naturally feeble constitution seemed to require it, though of course this is by no means a sufficient justification for even occasional excess. That he broke up at forty-six is less marvellous than that he lasted so long. Nothing but the most indomitable spirit, fortified by a conviction of the goodness of his cause, could have borne him up under such a load as perhaps never fell to the lot of an English Minister before or since, added to the pressure of a physical weakness hard enough to bear without that load.

We have thus drawn out two, at least defensible, parallelisms. Enough has been said to show that they do not lose their value, because Athens does duty for France in one and the Athenian Minister for the English Minister in the other. They will be considered more or less useful by different persons in giving life and reality to times fertile in political examples. But the successive changes in the Athenian Constitution, the character of its developed Democracy, the broad outlines of its Party-government, and some other features, give its history a value for us of the present day which must be patent to all. We may perhaps modestly attempt to make a few deductions from it.

First:—We have in this history, as in a most perfect mirror, an exhibition of a Constitution in which numbers alone formed the basis of government. There were many Democracies in Greece, but here we have the typical instance, described to us with all the splendour of diction, the fidelity of observation, the details of growth, culmination, and decay. What impression does the study of it leave on the mind? That there is

something fascinating in this notion of absolute political equality, this direct share in the government possessed by every citizen, all readers of Mr. Grote's history, to say nothing of any other work, will perhaps admit. What we have ventured to call a more sober and philosophical view, supported by those authors from whom there is in reality no appeal,* will bid us strip off the mask. And when we have laid bare its true features we find that this ancient Democracy, fair-seeming as it was, was only another name for Tyranny. We do not find ourselves able to admit that its success while a Pericles is at its head is any argument in its favour; for not only is the State-policy which even its best man finds himself obliged to pursue a policy marked with speedy ruin, but we find that this Constitution cannot stand under the conditions of average humanity; that it requires and supposes perfection, is based on theory, and fails in practice. We find that the State falls, not by accident, but necessarily, under such demagogues as Cleon, Hyperbolus and Alcibiades, or is obliged to fall back on such incompetent leaders as Nicias; that its caprices are so violent that it cannot make full use of even such weapons as these, paralysing them with fear, or checking them in full career; that it is attended with incorrigible corruption; that it breaks out into paroxysms of fearful cruelty, succeeded indeed sometimes, but generally too late, by repentance; that it is hateful to its weaker allies, and universally voted dangerous by its independent neighbours. This is surely a sufficient

* *e.g.* Plato, Thucydides, and Aristophanes. Plato's magnificent description of Demos, the typical monster, and the way in which it was fed and petted by its keepers, forms one of the most brilliant pages of the 'Republic.'

condemnation. If a Tyranny or an Oligarchy is detestable, it is scarcely questionable that a pure Democracy, as understood in ancient times, is worse than either; at least, this was the opinion of the best writers of those times, and of most moderns till quite our own day.

But the question for us is—How far must this experience of ancient be taken to guide us in an estimate of modern Democracy? If we apply it without making allowance for the great distinction between the two, we shall be led into mistakes. Two chief differences confront us. On the one hand, a thoroughly organized representative system must, no doubt, largely modify the Democracy of the ancients. The numbers actually meeting to consult are now smaller. On the other hand, that very large proportion of the working class of ancient States which consisted of slaves was in those days excluded from the most democratic of ancient polities. What we should call the upper and middle classes alone took part in the government. How far does one difference counteract the other? Does the result, after the two are balanced one against the other, leave us nearly where the ancients were, with only such distinctions as modern habits of thought, Christianity, the qualities of race, and the traditions of the past, have created?—a problem which in this place we can only state. At any rate, the conditions of the two systems are not the same. Yet it would be a most narrow view which would on that account reject the warnings of antiquity. On the contrary, it would be more true to assert that the spirit of a Constitution in which the force of mere numbers is supreme must be taken as a fixed quantity. We have seen what it is. Those who find a similar Constitution established, or progressing towards establish-

ment, have need for the most anxious watchfulness; for they may be sure that precisely as it approximates to the ancient direct and supreme voice of mere numbers in practical government, it will faithfully reproduce the phenomena of the older experiment. Modern examples are as yet few. Indeed we have, with the exception of the short-lived madness of France, so soon quenched in seas of blood, no instance of a pure Democracy in action in any large State until the establishment of the independence of the United States of America; nor, it may be said, even there, under conditions free from the traditions of European politics, till quite of late years. They afford the great standing lesson of modern times, to be spelt out in telegrams and newspapers to-day, and by-and-by to take its place amongst the stock examples of politics.* It is ours to read it in no carping spirit of contemptuous superiority. Those who are now working out their most difficult problem are not responsible for what they have inherited. It is for them to make the best of their political condition, and to apply, as far as may be, the political mind of their English ancestors to repair the evils they have suffered from a premature separation for which both countries are equally responsible. It is the absolute novelty of Democracy on such a scale which led M. de Tocqueville to make the remark already quoted; and yet perhaps our kinsmen have still something to learn from antiquity.

But for Englishmen, who have not yet parted with that splendid inheritance they have received, there is of course special significance in the teaching of the Greek authors. Those whose Constitution is the slow

* The Civil War in America was raging in its utmost fury when this Lecture was delivered.

growth of many centuries, and the model on which modern Constitutions are formed, will at least learn *caution* from antiquity; for they will perceive the irrevocability of popular changes, the impossibility of recovering any institution which has once been thrown aside, the consequences of admitting dangerous *principles* into political science, and how easy it is to lose sight of the rights of one class in legislating for the relief of another. In short, they will learn to think for themselves, to shake themselves clear of the commonplaces which have a tendency to fill a political atmosphere, and to recur continually to such questions as—Will such and such changes in the Constitution throw the power of government into hands which are fit to use it? Will the new interests swamp and overpower the old? Ought they to do so? Will not something known to be good be sacrificed for a doubtful advantage? Is the community ripe for such and such a change? Or will a violent shock be produced which will shake the whole fabric of society? They will not, however, as we shall see presently, blindly set themselves against all change; for that would be the surest way to destroy what they wish to conserve. Again, the more faithfully they imbibe the teaching of antiquity, the more plainly will they learn to distinguish between that equality before the law which we have long possessed, the ancient *ἰσονομία*, and that equality of right to govern which is often so ignorantly confused with it, and which is condemned by all theory and practice. They will see the need of accurately studying their own mixed government, and observing carefully its origin, its history, and its modern development. They will gain that habit of mind which will teach them to touch the defects of their

Constitution tenderly, to choose the fitting time for reform, and to place themselves in the attitude of resistance when reforms are unwisely pressed.* The great books read in our School of Law and Modern History, Blackstone, Hallam, Hume, Lingard, and the rest, can scarcely fail to teach us these lessons. Let us not submit to be robbed of the teaching of Thucydides.

And next, observing how surely in the career of a self-governed people, ancient or modern, step after step does necessarily bring one class after another into possession of political power, we learn to look about for the best means of averting a great danger; and we see that, if we are to rally each of these classes in succession round the Constitution, we must educate them beforehand. This is indeed a trite observation; but it is not so generally perceived that this education must be moral and religious as well as intellectual. The classes which ruined Athens were intellectual enough. Even in heathen times the signal for political debasement was given by the overthrow of religion. A little reflection on these examples will show that this education must not be mere mechanical instruction, not mere power of reading a newspaper, but an education which includes history, an education which teaches men to reason, to weigh evidence, to control impulse, to choose the solid in preference to the showy, to distinguish between the specious people-flatterer and the capable statesman. How many of the very books from which these classes are taught require to be rewritten! Perhaps we are only as yet at the very threshold of the work which lies before us.

* See some excellent remarks on this subject in Sir G. C. Lewis's 'Best Form of Government.' (Parker, Son, and Bourn.)

And, then, being summoned to witness such a deterioration of national virtue as took place at Athens, we are led to ask whether, in a state of society to which our own is beginning to offer some points of resemblance, it is possible to detect any particular agency which bears the same features in both cases. If in that Athenian society, for instance, we observe a systematic moral corruption in vigorous and deadly action, if we find ourselves listening to demagogues flattering the people in every foible, and sophists poisoning the moral springs of youth, appealing in turn to every wrong principle;—such as the absolute rights of the stronger, expediency in avowed preference to justice, the sweetness of revenge, the negation of a fixed standard of right and wrong,—we shall be more likely to discover the false basis on which our own national and social acts are too often defended both in newspapers and books. And if the mischief done by a debased press can only be met by means of the press itself, those who have learnt to read antiquity to any purpose and to recognise the duties superadded by Christianity, will be the foremost in this noblest of tasks.

We have spoken of the analogies afforded by Athenian Party-government to our own, and of the one previous instance it affords of a civilized people living under a regular government of this sort for any length of time, or at any rate the sole instance of which we have any sufficient account. As might be expected in a Constitution based on so simple a democratical system, the leaders of the party of Innovation have the best of it almost throughout. The Conservative leaders, as we should call them, have an uphill game. They are always on the losing side, until for a short time national

disaster sobers the multitude, or a successful conspiracy enables the more violent of their body to seize the government by force. Such periods are exceptional. The popular party generally secures the ablest men—Themistocles, Pericles, Ephialtes, Demosthenes, who represent the more respectable heads of the party; Cleon, Alcibiades, and others, who represent the less. The Institution of Ostracism had no doubt something to do with this result, for it was the natural weapon of the popular party. The Conservatives fought with a rope round their necks. It required an almost superhuman strength of mind to support them in coming forward. They who did so must have had to make great sacrifices. The party was represented by men who had to trust to their wealth or reputation as generals. They were slower and far less efficient as orators than their opponents. They were often scarcely felt as a drag on the popular movement. In short, the leaders of the party of resistance, who saw only too plainly whither the vessel of the State was drifting, were mainly gallant men who excite our admiration for the spirit with which they clung to what they thought right, in spite of unpopularity; but it is evident that the phenomenon of modern times was present then also,—the apathy and selfishness of the rich and educated, the want of a public, self-sacrificing spirit amongst the mass of those on whom the defence of institutions fell. It was no light thing to face an Athenian mob. It was much the easiest and safest thing to join the pack and hunt down the "aristocrats." Popular admiration was very cheaply gained, and a very agreeable thing to possess. It paid well.

But perhaps the "Conservative" party at Athens did,

in reality, misapprehend the nature of the Constitution in which they found themselves. They appear to have rested on methods of policy which were obsolete. It may have been their own fault that they did not put at the head of affairs men who could match the demagogues at their own weapons. They may have been too easily satisfied with the dull, respectable, wealthy men who presented themselves. A self-governing country cannot afford this waste of opportunity. The studious cultivation of the qualities necessary to command the ear of the public, the highest possible education, the most generous self-devotion, the most faithful, liberal, and energetic support of men so trained, when they can be obtained, this,—for the party which has to support established institutions in a free State, seems to be a necessity.

Nor is the example of Athenian history favourable to a notion which has in some few instances been supported in modern times by considerable men, viz., that Party can be dispensed with in a self-governed State. No doubt it is a clumsy expedient, a poor substitute for a perfectly just and equable rule,—very liable to abuse, easily degenerating into faction, very imperious, and very much tending to cramp the greatness of individual conceptions. But the question remains, whether any thing else is, in a free State, possible. When people virtually govern themselves, it must be admitted that no principles of government can prevail except through the means of combination. Individuals are lost when isolated. The country loses the benefit of their agency unless they give up something. Small knots, again, of independent politicians exhibit, as a rule, the defects without the advantages of a party. At any rate, when

one party combines, those who disagree with them cannot afford to remain uncombined.* The organization

* Some words for which the Lecturer is responsible, in a late review of the new 'Life of Wilberforce,' may perhaps, without impertinence, be appended by way of illustration :—

"The political question forced on the reader over and over again, as he reads this fascinating book, is that of a politician's duty as to 'party.' Wilberforce made a conscience of never joining either side. Though member for undivided Yorkshire, and one of the very best speakers in the House, he yet held independence to be his duty. Ought good men to imitate him? We believe not. His real ground for adopting this line was his conviction, that the abolition of the slave trade could only be promoted by his neutrality. Once adopted, other considerations strengthened his resolution. Yet it may even be a question whether he would not have succeeded sooner had he joined a party. Most of his disappointments arose from his not being necessary to a Minister, and he could have been so had he taken the usual course. But, granting that he was right on this point, wise men will remember that such a cause as the Abolition only presents itself on rare occasions in a nation's history, and that what might be right in a Wilberforce may not be right in ordinary men. In a free country party-government is a necessity. With all its evils it is as necessary to the social and political, as the food we eat to the natural body. Some, within these parties, will act on lower motives than others, but it is as possible for party men to act on the highest as it is to the most independent politicians outside a party. It may become necessary to reconstitute parties from time to time; they may have outlived their objects and watchwords; but, after all, this is seldom the case to any great extent, for behind the immediate anachronism lies generally the fundamental principle of difference; yet whether this is the case or not, the separation of individuals from the great bulk of their fellow politicians is more generally a sign of pride, vanity, and obstinacy, than of honesty, wisdom, and a commendable independence. That we do not for a moment attribute these faults to the great man whose life we are noticing is apparent from the tenour of all we have said; but the caution is necessary in times when squeamishness is too often taken for independence, and when men who pretend to hover between two parties too often end by throwing their weight into that which leads them and their country down the easy but fatal hill of revolution.

of the Conservative party at Athens appears to have been thoroughly defective. We find a want of reliance upon the power of their own principles, a shrinking from the trouble of trying to influence and convince their opponents, and a too ready resort to the easy substitute of exclusive societies. We hear of the formation of certain most narrow and exclusive oligarchical clubs, and very little else of a higher character. In themselves these *συνωμοσίαι* rather afford a warning than an example.

No doubt such associations have their use. What we call Clubs are part of the necessary life of a free country; but their natural tendency seems to be towards narrowness, prejudice, and violence. It may be hoped that the Jacobins and Cordeliers were the last modern reproduction of that type of Athenian association which Thucydides has immortalized; but in all political clubs the spirit which sent forth the aristocratic assassins of the short-lived Athenian oligarchic revolution, and the cruel democrats of Paris, is, we may be sure, that which in times of excitement is always to be feared and guarded against.

How far the Athenian system of Colonies and dependent States is capable of affording instruction to modern times, though closely connected with the development of political parties,—inasmuch as colonies give, along with domestic grievances and foreign wars, the great opportunity for party combinations,—is too wide a subject for this lecture. The existence of a multitude of such dependencies attached to such a State as Athens must

Their shoulders applied unpretendingly but vigorously to the wheel in good time, might have saved their country from a terrible catastrophe."

suggest many analogies to Englishmen. If the lesson had been wisely studied, it might have prevented our quarrel with our American colonies. Those States might have retained their connection till they were ripe for separation; the seeds of long future hostility would not have been sown; and the two countries, when the hour of separation came, might have proved that mutual support to one another which we may perhaps yet hope some day to witness. Without asserting that it rules one of the greatest questions of our times, it is at least noticeable that the position of Athens collapsed into almost insignificance when her dependencies dropped off. As nations progress in their onward career, it may be prudent that they should from time to time review their position as to their colonies, and that not only with regard to themselves, but relatively to each other and the neighbouring States of each. A connection desirable at one time may not be so at another; but the mere material argument of pecuniary loss and gain, based on the condition of affairs at a particular moment, is far from sufficient to settle the question.

The moral weight and consideration given by Colonies to a nation, the support she may gain from them at a critical period, the use others may make of what she discards, the sacred obligations implied in forming a colony, the force of the link which binds the past with the present—these and many other such points, varying in different cases, will always be taken into account by sound statesmen; for they are by no means sentimental or transcendental arguments, as some would have us believe, but, on the contrary, lie at the root of the whole matter.

Lastly, the contemplation of this period of Athenian

history supplies some strong arguments for a policy of peace, or at any rate against all but the most necessary wars. M. de Tocqueville has pronounced that the tendency of a Democracy is naturally towards peace. Events have not as yet proved the truth of his remark. He also says, that war is the grand evil to be feared by a democratic State, for when war is once begun, the army of a Democracy will always desire to continue the state of war; and consequently the alternative of ruin by internal divisions or subjugation by a domestic despot is always imminent. This dictum agrees well with the history we have been considering. It found an illustration in France. America fills us with anxiety.* It is a warning for ourselves. According to this view, the more the democratic element preponderates, the more dangerous will war be to domestic unity and strength, and the less able should we be in consequence of any war which might arise, to take the place befitting a member of the European Confederation; the more probably should we be exposed to disgrace when obliged to act. But precedents, whatever M. de Tocqueville may say, are, as we have already asserted, not in favour of the immunity of a democratic State from war. The inference is, that checks on democracy should not be discarded. Cosmopolitanism is very well in its proper place; but patriotism, like charity, begins at home. At any rate, when a nation under the process of democratic development is goaded into war by a popular sentiment, it is right to remember that the

* These remarks were made, it will be remembered, during the great American war. Its conclusion is too recent and its consequences too indefinite, as yet, to add any complete illustration in favour of, or against, the prophecy of the philosopher.

danger to its internal and external condition will be greatly increased if the war should cause a severe strain on the resources of the State. The patriot will cherish whatever enables his country to emerge from any war into which she may be driven with least injury. Wars, in short, are certain to take place, however much peace may be coveted; and the consequences are scarcely less certain. Wise men will connect the two facts.

Bishop Butler, in a well-known passage, has drawn a fine picture of the influence which a perfect State would exert in the world. "In such a State," says he, "there would be no such thing as faction; but men of the greatest capacity would, of course, all along have the chief direction of affairs willingly yielded to them, and they would share it among themselves without envy. Each of these would have the part assigned him to which his genius was peculiarly adapted; and others who had not any distinguished genius would be safe, and think themselves very happy, by being under the protection and guidance of those who had. Public determinations would really be the result of the united wisdom of the community, and they would be faithfully executed by the united strength of it. Some would in a higher way contribute, but all would in some way contribute to the public prosperity; and in it each would enjoy the fruits of his own virtue. And as injustice, whether by fraud or force, would be unknown among themselves, so they would be sufficiently secured from it in their neighbours. For cunning, false self-interest, and confederacies in injustice, (which are) ever slight, and accompanied with faction and intestine treachery—these, on the one hand, would be found mere childish folly and weakness when set in opposition

against wisdom, public spirit, union inviolable, and fidelity on the other; allowing both a sufficient length of years to try their force. Add the general influence which such a kingdom would have over the face of the earth, by way of example particularly, and the reverence which would be paid it. It would plainly be superior to all others, and the world must come gradually under its empire, not by means of lawless violence, but partly by what must be allowed to be just conquest, and partly by other kingdoms submitting themselves voluntarily to it, through a course of ages, and claiming its protection, one after another, in successive exigencies."*

In its perfection such a picture is Utopian. Butler only uses it as an ideal illustration. Universal empire will never again be realised until some great change comes over mankind. But the steady effort to realise the idea and satisfy the conditions proposed is not Utopian. All experience tells us that precisely as a State approximates towards these conditions, the effects here depicted do most surely follow. Patience, moderation, justice, fair dealing, consistency, self-sacrifice,—the virtues of individuals, are also virtues which may be and sometimes are exhibited in greater or less degree by States. Modern States have even advanced so far as to profess and parade such principles; their contemporaries are pretty well aware how much or how little claim they really have to be credited with them. It is the business of every citizen to weigh well what sort of government, human nature being what it is, what sort of institutions, what sort of political and social influences, are best calculated to make such professions real; re-

* 'Analogy,' chap. iii.

membering that what is not abstractedly the best is generally best when it is once established, when it has slowly grown up along with the life of a nation, and when it has gathered round it those principles of respect and loyalty which can never be hastily planted, or, if they are, will be sure to wither speedily and hopelessly decay.

Thus the consideration of Athenian history, as we find it in ancient authors, may not be without its use in clearing our ideas on the points which press for settlement in modern times.

LECTURE III.*

THE RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.—PART I.

NOVEMBER 16, 1865.

THE time has perhaps passed when theories of the relations of Church and State could command attention. Warburton, Paley, Coleridge, Arnold, Mr. Gladstone, and Lord Macaulay, have had their day, each in his turn. None of their contributions have been without value; but their way of dealing with the subject was, it may be thought, rather suited to a past than to the present generation. Rightly or wrongly, we are learning to look more to facts than to theories, and to inquire into the history of what we see around us rather than to rest satisfied with philosophical discussions. We are learning to recognize that a thing which we have inherited from a remote period stands on a footing which does not admit of our considering it sufficiently treated when merely dealt with as an open question, or put before us as a matter of choice whether we shall accept it or not. If we find our inheritance impaired, it is to history as well as to reason and policy that we must look for light upon the repairs which that inheritance may from time to time demand.

* This and the next Lecture have been published separately, and have passed through a First Edition.

The two last-named writers have given us, each from his own point of view, the highest results of the controversy in its abstract form. It might not be useless to attempt an impartial statement of what was left at the end of that controversy; but it will be sufficient for our purpose to say that, while the most determined adherents of Church principles will scarcely support, any more than Mr. Gladstone himself is supposed to support,* every statement or every deduction in the able work of that writer's younger days, there are in all probability very few Churchmen of any kind in the present day who would accept the fundamental principles on which the most brilliant of essayists has built his structure.† Few would now be willing to forget the lessons of all history, and exclude the establishment of religion from the prime functions of government. Few take so false a view of morality, the only basis and bond of government, as to suppose that it can exist without a Faith; few believe that such a Faith can lay a firm and permanent hold on the various elements, rich and poor, of a widely scattered society without the assistance of the State. Few would now consider it a sufficient argument to point out that a Railway Company, a Club, or a Joint Stock Bank, perform their functions without any agreement on religious matters; or that because it may happen that two portions of an army can combat in unison, although of different Creeds, that therefore a Nation as a whole must be considered free from all responsibility for the Faith of those who compose it. We may indeed have

* This would of course be stated much more strongly if written now, after Mr. Gladstone's open repudiation of his book.

† Macaulay's Essay on Gladstone's 'Church and State.'

been slow in learning lessons of toleration, but the most tolerant do not find themselves obliged to give up the position that the public recognition and support of the Christian religion, as taught by the Church, is the best possible condition for a nation; and that all which falls short of it is a deterioration, a condition to be deplored, a condition to be delayed as long as possible, if it is still possible to save the principle upon which alone a Church Establishment can be properly retained. When we hear such a deformed and really unnatural position as that of an organized State without an Established Religion, not excused on the ground of untoward circumstances, but held up to admiration as theoretically superior to all others, we are irresistibly reminded of a certain ancient fable about a fox that had lost its tail.*

What, then, are the facts as to the relations of Church and State in this country? What is the history of those relations? What have we inherited? What do we now possess of our inheritance? What have we in common with other branches of the Church? What do those other branches possess? We cannot in two short lectures do much more than indicate the lines of inquiry, but that may be better than nothing.

We must start with an axiom. The Church is One, Catholic, and Apostolic. She may be separated into

* To this brief summary of arguments for a State Establishment of the Church should be added the security thus given (unless revolutionary principles prevail) for private endowments, and the substantial independence of the transitory whims of their flocks thus secured for the clergy, as well as the guarantee for sound teaching given to the laity, if the proper conditions of the connection are preserved. Permanence, universality, union, and independence, with all their corollaries, can only be secured by an Establishment.

parts, but her parts are in essence entirely homogeneous. Each branch possesses exactly the same sacred deposit which was entrusted to the Church at the beginning in order to be handed on to the end of time: and if any branch loses this deposit, it ceases *ipso facto* to belong to the one Whole. Each branch owns the same Divine Head, refers back to the same original Constitution, rejects all notion of any subsequent origin. The bishops and clergy of each branch of the Church are the appointed guardians of the one deposit. That view of the Church of England which would degrade her, nay, transform her whole existence, by asserting her to be the mere creature of the State, an invention of the Tudor princes, has been too often refuted to require notice here; it is contrary to the best-known facts. She has the same lineaments as her sister Churches of the East and West; her connection with the State may be of a different kind, but it leaves her equally possessed with them of all that constitutes a true branch of the Church. Let us glance for a moment at the general condition of State-connection in those other branches, and in order to do so let us mark the principles upon which the connection was first formed in the undivided Church.

Under the heathen Emperors, surrounded by enemies, and afflicted, yet strengthened, by persecution, the Church, like Israel in Egypt, silently grew and multiplied. Her internal organization, derived from the Apostles, had so much in common with the local institutions under which the Græcized populations of the East flourished, that, by the time the civilized world had grown ripe for the establishment of Christianity, the ecclesiastical framework of society had be-

come the most vigorous and permanent force to be found on the face of the earth. It would be more correct to say that the Church of the fourth century forced the State into combination with her, than to speak of the Emperors as patrons of the Church. No other policy than an acknowledgment of Christianity as the State religion could have made government possible. The mass of the people of the East, the source from which the army was so largely drawn, had seriously and intelligently embraced Christianity. It was not so in the West, but the political power of Paganism was gone. From the East the State-Christianity, retarded by the different nature of Western society and institutions, gradually, in spite of all obstacles, made its way. The powers of the whole Roman world became the powers of Christ.

And now, through the divisions amongst Christians, began the struggles between Church and State, the struggles between those of the people who most regarded political government, supported by the still-existing influences of Paganism, and those of them who most regarded ecclesiastical interests. The struggle is gathered up into the persons of those who represent either class. At first the Emperor is the "nursing father" of the Church, whose supremacy over all its external and civil affairs is gratefully acknowledged, and whose presidency at General Councils is gracefully conceded; the clergy are the free subjects, not the tools, of the civil power. But the independence of the ecclesiastical organization begins to excite the Emperor's jealousy. He begins to dread, and not without some reason, an *imperium in imperio*. The heresies with which the Church was never to cease from con-

tending afforded a party within its own bosom for plots and alliances. To divide and conquer became the policy of the civil government. Yet, as we all know, after the bitter conflict of the fourth century, the victory was given to the "faith once delivered;" and so completely was the principle established throughout the Roman world of a strict adherence to that Faith as guarded (not altered) by General Councils, that the adhesion of the Emperors to Orthodoxy became a political canon, never afterwards to be overthrown.* It became an unalterable law of the Empire. The ecclesiastical machinery of their subjects might still be used by the Eastern emperors for civil purposes, but the doctrinal independence of the Church was henceforth secure. It was based on the people. The knowledge of, and interest in, the faith were not confined to an upper or middle class; they were the inheritance of all. As the Eastern Empire creeps on into the Byzantine, we may find Emperors deposing Patriarchs, or even temporarily interfering against the faith, but that faith had taken too firm a hold to be overthrown. At the worst of times some Emperor was raised up who made it his pride to secure the privileges of the Church. Philosophers may sneer at the insignificance of the point on which the multitude may in times of danger have made a stand; but the extreme obstinacy with which the outworks were defended had no slight effect on the final defence of the citadel. The sacred deposit was more and more defiled with superstition, more and more degraded by the servility of its guardians, more and more weakened by puerilities; but the long and

* See Finlay's 'History of Greece under Foreign Dominion,' *passim*.

interesting, though melancholy records of Byzantine history still, to the last, show a real and effective independence of State dictation on all matters concerning the faith.*

And we know how the constancy of the Oriental Church, thus marvellously maintained through so many ages, was rewarded. We know how when the clouds gathered round her, when the last attenuated thread of Christian government at Constantinople was rudely snapped, the Church had done her work; how, in spite of corruptions, she had handed down her sacred deposit through the long ages of Saracen and Turkish oppression; and how, when that oppression had wholly destroyed Christian independence, when the faults of Church and State had worked out their punishment, the Church was still to be seen preserved as by a miracle amidst the wreck.

And we know, not only how it has been itself preserved, but what has been the consequence. The tenacity with which the Faith has been retained by the Greek and Slavonic races has in its turn kept their Nationality alive during a prolonged slavery; and these long-suffering people appear once more to be about to enter—some indeed have already entered,—upon a happier period. It is the second time in these classic regions that civilization has been saved by the Church; for without the National vitality afforded by the Church of the fifth and sixth centuries, the barbarian invasions which proved fatal to the West would most surely have been equally fatal to the East. What was witnessed then we are witnessing in a different form now.

* The sketch given in Gibbon is of itself sufficient to prove this statement.

And in the history of Russia we may read in somewhat different characters the same story. There, through the traditions derived from Constantinople, have reappeared many of the phases of Byzantine history. There also we read the history of a domineering civil power, a too servile Church; but there also we find the one indispensable claim to orthodoxy, the unaltered, undiluted Faith, the same to-day as it has ever been.* And it has survived (humanly speaking) for the same reason as the mother Church; it has fastened on the hearts of the people; it is mixed up most intimately with their whole social and domestic life; it is anchored so firmly that no profane or unscrupulous Czar, no turbulent faction of nobles, has been permanently successful in any attempt to shake it. The connection of Church and State is stamped with the peculiar marks of Russian nationality, in many respects so Oriental, so unlike our own; but the only true terms of that connection are in the main understood. The Church applies her utmost influence in the service of the State; the State supports and protects the Church. The State keeps a certain check—on the whole perhaps a salutary check—upon the action of the Church in its temporal relations, but well knows within what bounds it is safe to interfere. Anything

* One of the most easily accessible proofs of the primitive purity of the doctrines of the Oriental Church may be found in the tract written by His Eminence Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, when he was Professor of Divinity at Petersburgh in 1815, and lately republished with his sanction by the Russo-Greek Committee of the American Church. Copies can be obtained through the Eastern Church Association, 22, Boltons, London, S.W. Of course this reference to the purity of the doctrine must not be taken as a defence of all the ritual and practice of the Oriental Church.

approaching to State interference with doctrine is, it is needless to say, never dreamt of. The Church is governed by Churchmen, and the voice of the Emperor is heard through them. The memory of patriarchs like Philip and Nikon is not extinct. If the office of Patriarch has been extinguished by a Peter, the Holy Governing Synod is at least no bad representative of ruling power in the Church.*

The scene changes when we turn to look at the relations of Church and State in Western Europe, but we find the same landmarks. The Teutonic settlers in the Empire erect Nationalities of a type very different from that of Constantinople. The religion of the Church is the religion of the conquered; the Church does not all at once come into connection with the State; it takes time to establish relations between both parties; and, when they are formed, it is between the conquerors and the clergy of the conquered people, scarcely at all between the conquerors and the people themselves. Thus the idea of an *alliance* germinates, and soon colours more or less the whole history of modern Europe. The Church comes on the stage of the barbaric nations from a point external to themselves, either from the midst of conquered natives owning a sort of allegiance to the Roman Patriarch, or direct from Rome itself, a spiritual centre, which claims a right of interference, and which receives the deference due from a daughter to a mother Church.

* "From the above account it may appear how utterly false is the modern notion, so industriously circulated by Roman Catholics, that in Russia the Church is the mere creature of the State; whereas probably, at the present moment, it enjoys more freedom in that empire than anywhere else in the world."—(Neale's 'History of the Holy Eastern Church,' vol. i. p. 58.)

And now, as the incoherent barbaric kingdoms decay, and scatter, and again reform, with every variety of shape, almost like the fantastic combinations of the kaleidoscope, the Church, with the ecclesiastical order very highly developed, and with her all-embracing bond of unity in the highest contrast with the shifting chaos of political anarchy around, gains rapidly and steadily in relative strength. As conquered Greece took captive her captors, so the conquered Romans vanquish the Teutonic conquerors. At each change of dynasty it becomes more and more worth the while of the new princes to court the Ecclesiastical Order. Church and State become interwoven with one another; the National Assemblies are more or less Church Councils, the Church Councils more or less National Assemblies. At length we have in the West, not uninfluenced by the example of the Byzantine Empire, so august even in its decadence, and to these barbarians so mysterious and unapproachable, a system of connection between Church and State almost as intimate as that of the East. It is equally based on the condition of orthodoxy on both sides, equally arises out of political necessity, is equally subject to danger at the hands of particular princes, above all it equally provides for the substantial independence and freedom of the Church in matters of doctrine and discipline. Here, however, is the distinctive difference. While in the East the strong hold of orthodox belief on the middle and lower classes of society formed a barrier within the State against which all permanent oppression was shattered, in the West the external authority of Rome supplied a considerable part of the support.

And truly this authority was much needed; for the

aristocratic character of Roman society in the Western Empire had lost nothing of its prevalence by the settlement of the Teutonic tribes. It only took a new form. The Feudalism of the Middle Ages excluded the masses from any real share in government, nor were they assembled in any centre of power from which their weight could tell as it told at Constantinople. Had not Rome been appointed as the mistress of the nations, as the make-weight in the balance of forces, as the standard to which all national Churches could turn, laying from generation to generation its firm grasp on the brute hand of power, it is not easy to see what in those rude times could have saved the Church from utter degradation. Had Rome but given to the nations the Liturgy in the vernacular, an advantage from which the Oriental Church had derived all along so much strength, how different might have been the history of Christendom! But how different also her part in that history! As it was, the good she was provided on purpose to do lasted on till the nations were sufficiently trained to act without her. The critical time was bridged over. The Church's spiritual independence of the State was secured as a condition of her connection with it.

And now, as the Papal corruptions and impostures increased, as the pretensions of Rome became more hollow, and her influence began to be undermined by her own self, the National Churches on their part began to base themselves more securely on the people. The rise to power of the Third Estate synchronized with the decadence of Rome. Church and State had to fight out the battle in each Nationality with varying results. The power of the Papacy is almost destroyed by its

French Captivity, its fatal Schism. The Councils of the West are summoned to answer that appeal which Rome can no longer be trusted to hear; and they prepare the way for the great religious change which was soon to follow. Then comes the time when the relations of Church and State are to be watched under new conditions in those countries where the yoke of Rome was thrown off. Those countries inherited all the machinery, all the guarantees of spiritual independence —National Councils, Appeals to a common standard, Freedom of action and self-government within certain bounds. How did they fare? how in their changed form did they retain their inheritance?

Our present purpose does not require us to trace in detail, though a very valuable study in itself, the relations of Church and State in those countries of the West where the Reformation did not shape all such relations afresh. Directly or indirectly no doubt the Reformation has affected those countries also. New Concordats have been framed, or old ones modified. But in all alike the very terms of their connection with Rome, and through her with Roman Christendom, have supplied some sort of guarantee over and above that existing in the nation itself for the preservation of doctrine and discipline. Whatever else those countries have lost by their failure to throw off the Roman corruptions, they have at least kept this. If in them, as with ourselves, the State has often used the Church improperly for its own ends, has appointed Bishops for mere political purposes, has checked the proper freedom of Church action, and, even where conscientiously attempting to keep within its prescribed duty of preventing action prejudicial to the State, has often overstepped

those bounds, yet the basis of faith, however overlaid with the grossest errors, and, in the main, discipline, have been secure. The Church is ruled through Churchmen; the public opinion of the Church cannot be overborne. The old struggle, so familiar to ourselves before the Reformation, between the National and Roman interests, may be constantly going on, but the substantial independence of the Church on matters vital to her existence is an axiom beyond all dispute.

Nor shall we at present venture on that wide review of Church-and-State relations in the Reformed Communions of Europe which would supply us with endless examples of variety in this matter; some, as in Prussia, exhibiting something very like a pure Erastianism; some, as in Sweden, a Church-independence, especially in the appointment of Bishops, (though existing along with a Royal Supremacy,) which is in many respects a complete model.*

* "In the Church law of 1686 it is said that the oversight, care, and protection of the Church and Commonalty are intrusted by God to the King. It is not understood in Sweden that by these expressions the King has authority over faith, or worship, or matters purely spiritual, but only over such things as concern the Church in her outward relations, and in reference to her union with the State." "His right to appoint the Archbishop and Bishops, as also the pastors of the so-called royal benefices, he exercises under many limitations. It is ruled by law, and the King always chooses one of the three persons presented to him as elected by the majority of voices among the clergy, a choice to which he is also limited in the case of the pastors of congregations, except in the royal benefices." —('History of the Reformation in Sweden,' by L. A. Anjou, Councillor to the King of Sweden. Translated by Dr. Mason. New York, 1859. Appendix, pp. 660, 661.)

The true succession of the Swedish Episcopate is also defended with much force in this book by Professor Knos, of the University of Upsala.—(Appendix, p. 634.)

We shall for the remainder of these lectures confine ourselves to our own country, and in order to understand our modern condition must take a rapid survey of the early history of English Church-and-State. It may not be unprofitable to count over our treasures. It is no insular self-complacency which prompts us to see that we conserve our inheritance. The very statement of our privileges carries with it a lofty style of superiority which no other nation in the world can boast. For have we not here in combination what all others possess only in some mutilated form? Have we not monarchy and self-government, order and liberty, stability and progress, in the State, intimately bound up, by a law and a custom as old as the State itself, with a Church, as pure as the Primitive Church, and not wanting, as tested by her Orders and her formularies, in any of the formal characteristics which the definition of a true Church requires? If we understand clearly how such a Constitution has come down to us, we shall the better understand how in the midst of political changes its substantial features may be retained.

It is scarcely necessary to say that we should not be in our present position if the foundation of this most remarkable of all Church-and-State connections had not been solidly laid during the four centuries which preceded the Norman Conquest.* It is not a thing of yesterday. More than a thousand years have passed since the relations of Church and State were so intimately blended in this country with the very roots of

* For the purpose of these two Lectures the usual division of English history has been followed, viz., the division into three parts; the Saxon or Early-English; from the Conquest to the Reformation; and from the Reformation to our own time.

27395

the Constitution, so taught to interpenetrate one another in all functions of government, that, to use an old simile of which we have been lately very forcibly reminded,* they may well be compared to the mysterious and inseparable connection between the soul and the body of the individual man. But it should be observed that even then, so wisely did the far-reaching mind of our Teutonic ancestors look before and behind its immediate sphere of operation, so wonderfully were all the so-called accidents of the times guided for the best, that this government was never, on the one hand, a government by priests,—never, on the other hand, a slavery on the part of the Church. Owing a debt to Papal Rome scarcely less than any other of the barbaric kingdoms founded on the ruins of the Empire, yet the independence of the National Church was never compromised. With Bishops powerful in the Witenagemote, and seated side by side with the Earl in the Courts, the spectacle of a State governed by ecclesiastical Councils was never, even under a Dunstan, witnessed in England, as in Gothic Spain. The Councils of the Church were free and frequent, yet, as they depended not on the authority of the Pope, so neither did the King usurp any further power in them than that his consent should be held necessary in important matters. Converted by monks, and receiving from monastic institutions, as yet but little debased, all the benefits they were then able to afford; governed by kings and nobles who have supplied, perhaps, in proportion to their number a larger contribution to the rolls of canonization than any other aristocracy, no portion of

* Hook's 'Archbishops of Canterbury,' vol. iii. p. 7.

the Western Church so jealously guarded the marriage of their clergy, none more strenuously supported their Parish Priests against the ever-strengthening array of the Regular Ecclesiastics.

Where shall we look for the causes of this marvellous moderation of spirit, exceptional as it is, though not by any means unalloyed by a rude and phlegmatic temperament? Was it in any degree the consequence of our insular position? Was it part of that Christian inheritance derived from Celtic missionaries which affected the infancy of the Saxon State, not so perceptibly as the Roman form, but far more powerfully than is generally supposed? Was it due to the overwhelming preponderance of the Teutonic blood, so different from that mixture of races which obtained in other provinces of the Empire? All this, no doubt; but still more perhaps, the wisdom taught by suffering. Not in vain had the Danish invasions for a time submerged both Church and State in seas of blood. The premature civilization of a people too early taught to exchange the sword for the gown and the ploughshare, was thus checked: the inherent weakness of a too rapid political education was thus detected and strengthened. Together Church and State had suffered, together they rose; rose with a firmer and a wiser attachment to one another. If both were yet once more to fall into a condition too unhealthy for permanence, if the complement to the great qualities of the race was yet to be found in a kindred stock, trained under more intellectual and more chivalrous influences, if years of bitter suffering were yet to refine the political and ecclesiastical institutions of England, they were now too entirely one to be again separated. They were together strong enough to

assert in the course of ages the mastery over all the power of their conquerors.

Observe how the Saxon principles were for ever, so to speak, "cropping up" in after history. It is no mere fancy. We are accustomed to trace this Saxon influence on our laws; it is no less evident in the relations of Church and State. On Saxon precedents the very Conqueror (using them, no doubt, for his own objects) grounds his resistance to the Papacy, when, in the flush of his victorious career, Hildebrand demanded that submission from the Crown which this country had never yet yielded to Rome. It was the Saxon freedom of the Church which, as each Norman monarch ascended a throne, not his by natural right, he was obliged to give a charter to protect. It was on Saxon principles, in the main, that Henry II. and his great legal advisers sought to establish the relations of Church and State against what was, no doubt, the conscientious resistance of Becket. It was the Saxon spirit which supported and avenged the champion of the Church when the proceedings of the King turned the unbending priest, who was at least half a knight, into a martyr. It was the Saxon spirit which stood behind the barons at Runnymede, which expelled the French locusts in the time of John's feeble son, and which, under the auspices of Edward I., the first monarch who thoroughly represented it, once more consolidated a true and equitable relation between the Crown and the Altar. From the time of the great Edward to that of Henry VIII. it was the Saxon spirit which was surely and progressively modifying our feudal institutions, delivering the Church and State from one after another of the Roman innovations, and ensuring that when the great change came, it

should prove, not as in some other countries, a revolution, but a true Reformation; not indeed an unmixed blessing, but a change which left Church and State substantially what they were before, and capable of passing on to future generations all that was of essential value in either. That Saxon polity shewed such wonderful vitality because it was of the only sterling sort. It was a free and independent Branch of the Church in close relation with a Constitutional Government. And it may be worth remarking that the Faith of that Church was in all the most important points identical with that represented by our own modern English Prayer-book.*

With the Norman Conqueror came a new phase of Church and State. Dr. Hook has once more supplied us with an apt illustration: "The union thenceforth may be compared to the union between man and wife in one household. Although the general interest was one and the same, there was room for misunderstandings, disputes, and even for divorce. The almost immediate effect was a struggle for the mastery between two powers, the civil and ecclesiastical. If they were no longer one in action, who was to have the dominion?"† The metaphor might be much further extended; for it is the same in other words which is implied in that "Original Compact" of old writers, the field of many a contention in Constitutional battles. What the supposed Original Compact was, which no one

* 'Lathbury on Convocation,' p. 47 (second edition); Soames, 'History of the Anglo-Saxon Church,' *passim*. Lingard, in his 'History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church,' has weakened the force of some of Soames's arguments, but he cannot be said to have disproved the statement in the text.

† 'Archbishops of Canterbury,' vol. iii. p. 7.

ever saw, but which is none the less surely implied in the relation of Sovereign to subject, that and no less, as Bishop Warburton has remarked,* was present in the new Alliance of Church and State. A free and voluntary choice on both sides once made and unalterable, a sacred tie, a mutual benefit, a respect for the rights and privileges of each, a forbearance with the shortcomings of either, a studious care to avoid irritating disputes, the notion of protector and protected, of functions separate yet accordant, of a graceful deference due to the weaker party so long as it keeps its own place, supreme only in its own department—all this was implied in the alliance, and took a concrete form whenever the government of both parties fell into good hands. That during the disputes which so often occurred, the inevitable consequence of human imperfection, these abstract notions are often scarcely traceable, is no argument against their existence and constant presence. We note the storms because by their fury they force themselves on our attention; we take the calm weather as a matter of course, and make no note of it.

The confusion which is for ever besetting this subject now demands our notice. In England before the Conquest, as in the early Roman Empire, it is easy to conceive the same members of the State in their double capacity. In their civil capacity they are the State; in their ecclesiastical, the Church. The king and his nobles, the bishops and the clergy, are the representatives of the same people on either aspect of their position. But now the Conqueror has dissolved that peculiar tie, and has introduced the Continental, the Roman, system. The Clergy and the Laity are separated in

* 'Alliance,' B. ii. c. 3.

the Courts of Law. The Bishop no longer sits with the Earl; the clergy are tried in the Bishop's Court for criminal as well as civil offences. Separate interests, separate customs, separate bodies of law, take the place of the old united system. We find two rival wills, two separate *personæ*. The Canon Law, formed in the next century, gives shape and permanence to the Ecclesiastical Courts; the Common Law grows with its marvellous growth, entwined with the affections of the people, or at least of the upper classes, in the secular Courts. That rivalry between the clergy and the lawyers, which is said to have left its marks on society even to the present day, and which has found its constant expression in the struggles between the Courts of Chancery and Common Law, as well as in so many of the political conflicts of our history, was then commenced. Henceforth we find it scarcely possible to think of Church and State except as represented by the civil government on the one hand, by the clergy on the other. We lose sight of the Laity in general as a part of the Church; and yet we know they are there all the while. We know that the "Church" is just as much the People of England regarded in their spiritual capacity, and ministered to by properly constituted spiritual persons, as in Saxon times. This is the source of many of the errors made in discussion. Men are talking of two different things under the name of "Church."

We may convince ourselves of the difficulty of clearing our minds on the subject by observing how well-informed people even yet, after attention has been drawn to the error for so many years, persist in speaking of such and such a person's "going into the

Church," when they mean to say that he is going to take Holy Orders. This error, which has so worked itself into our very language, has perhaps been one cause of the dangers to which the Church has been exposed. It is one of those legacies of mediævalism of which we did not get clear at the Reformation; it is the ground of that cold carelessness, or at best lukewarmness of support, which leaves the battle of the Church to be fought by those who without the Laity at their backs are powerless in the conflict with evil.

It is more correct then to say that the struggle between the State and the Clergy as an Order commenced with the Conqueror. The weight in the balance lost by the Clergy in consequence of the change in their position was partly compensated by the far closer external connection with Rome, partly by the far more systematized alliances now made at home with whichever section of the body politic might best serve their turn at different times. The Conqueror, for instance, having, with the aid of Lanfranc, placed Norman ecclesiastics in all important posts as a means of securing his Conquest, the close connection between the Crown and the clergy is the first phase of the alliance. Not Charlemagne when he planted the clergy as a garrison in the midst of ferocious half-subdued borderers, not a Byzantine Emperor when his well-drilled Bishops were his most efficient State-officers, more sagaciously used the Ecclesiastical Order for the discipline of his subjects than William the Conqueror. Nor was ever prince better served. The cathedrals and the parish churches of the present day bear witness to the zeal and ability of the Norman ecclesiastics; the great place secured for their Order in the new organization of the realm,

the wrecks only of which are now visible, was their reward.

It can scarcely be doubted that when the traces of conquest had been somewhat obliterated by time, whatever may be set on the other side of the account, a change for the better had come over the clergy of this island. They became more learned, more active, more accomplished,—not less devoted. And there can be no doubt that their relative strength as a body had made an immense stride. What Guizot has remarked with regard to the clergy of the Empire, when the barbarians settled in its provinces, was here experienced in a still more marked manner, though on so much smaller a scale. With every class of society, with every one of the forces of the State, the Anglo-Norman clergy soon began to blend their interests. At first their fortunes depend on that of the Crown. With keen sagacity they support those members of their great patron's family who were most likely to secure that "good peace," and devote that attention to the land of their adoption which they saw, far more clearly than others, to be necessary for the healing of its wounds. With vast possessions, and with a feudal state like that of the greatest barons, with seats in the Great Council of the Realm, exceeding in number those of the laity, the hierarchy move about among the fierce Norman aristocracy their equals and not seldom their superiors. And each year they take up more and more of the down-trodden people into their ranks, swelled in number as those ranks were in that age to an extent we can scarcely measure now; till at the end of less than a century the Ecclesiastical Order, with its arms extending in every direction, its head in the Great

Council and the King's Court, its foot in every parish of the realm, is the arbiter and guide of the whole nation. And, as if this were not enough, the support of Rome, needful at times to curb the lawless will of a Rufus or a Beauclerc, to check the policy, good in the main, of an imperious Henry Plantagenet, to restore the trembling balance of regal power when the overwhelming forces of the barons, with French help, had well nigh extinguished it, to protect in fact and foster the liberties of the country, as it most surely did at times, in the infancy of the Constitution,—this support of Rome was also at the disposal of the clergy.

No wonder then that with all these advantages, to which may be added, what was closely connected with them all, the superior education and mental development which they undoubtedly possessed over all around them, and with all the claims to popular gratitude which they might most justly plead, as aiding to deliver the Saxons from their degradation, and, afterwards, the Villein-class from a wretched slavery (claims allowed by so unexceptionable a witness as Lord Macaulay),*— no wonder the ecclesiastical order came to be looked upon as the representative of religion, as the correlative of the State, as the body with or against which alliances were to be made, as, in short, the Church. But through this Roman connection, corrupt as the Papacy was daily becoming, and claiming, as it did every day more arrogantly, an unlimited obedience which it appeared to have less and less title to claim, it was inevitable that this "Church" should also be regarded more and more as something foreign, as well

* 'History of England,' vol. i., Introduction.

as external, to the State; and that, in consequence, as soon as the Constitution had grown into sufficient strength, she should be subjected to a series of organized attacks which exceedingly reduced and undermined her power. As Rome was at first her strength, so it soon became her weakness. The staff became rotten, and it broke.

Each of the next four centuries witnesses a further step in the gradual diminution of ecclesiastical power. The most exact form of the so-called Original Compact to which we can refer for the terms of the new alliance is that with which the Conqueror set out. On his part, the part of the State, as we have seen, the Church was placed in the independent position she held in the Continental States. That position carried with it the Church's own Synods, the Church's own Courts, a voice, or at least attention to her wishes, in election of Bishops. But it was worthy of that great man and of his great Archbishop that the one should impose, and the other admit, limitations to the power of the clergy, which after-experience showed to be absolutely necessary for the safe existence of a National Church. There was to be no divided allegiance to the Patriarch of the West, no Pope and anti-Pope for Englishmen; Church and State must be in accord on this point. There was to be no *imperium in imperio;* no decrees of Ecclesiastical Synods were to become the law of the land without the king's license. There was to be no weakening of the king's authority by the excommunication of his great lords till the nature of the offence had been certified to himself. Many of the struggles of the next two centuries arise out of the attempts of the ecclesiastics, often for long periods together suc-

cessful, to evade these laws: and though for the time their efforts may in some cases be justified,* yet it was well for all parties alike that these landmarks did on the whole remain fixed. But, on the other hand, other struggles arose from the proved insufficiency of these restrictions. It was very well for a powerful monarch like the Conqueror to establish an ecclesiastical independence of municipal law while he was at hand with the sagacious Lanfranc to keep order; but the lapse of a century fully proved the necessity of a further limitation. The evils of the system had by that time come to a head. The Becket struggle was its direct consequence. That struggle ended, and happily ended, in placing the clergy in their proper position on the vital point of criminal trials. It was the first great step towards making them real subjects of the realm; while at the same time our monarchs learnt a lesson as to the inherent power of the Church (in its larger sense), when stirred to its foundations, a lesson which was never afterwards forgotten. Another century was to pass before the relations of the State with the clergy could be placed on a durable footing, before the clergy could be truly considered subjects, owning an undivided temporal allegiance to their anointed Sovereign.

But in the mean time Magna Charta, in no slight degree through the efforts of the clergy, had become the law of the land for all time: and in that great instrument their claims and privileges were duly registered. Not then for the first time did the famous words, ECCLESIA LIBERA SIT, head a royal charter. They had formed a necessary part of charters already granted.

* See the Essays on Anselm in the Rev. R. W. Church's 'Essays and Reviews.'

They represented the sacred inheritance of earlier times. "It would have been," says Lingard, "more satisfactory if these liberties had been enumerated and described;" but we may be sure Stephen Langton knew his business well: he was the last man to make a mistake in this matter. It might not in the future secure a greater liberty for the Church, if her liberties were too definitely laid down according to the idea at that time entertained of them. It was thought better to leave the old expression, full of significance as it was, for the interpretation of those who were responsible for interpreting it rightly. The words echo down the ages, the law of the land now as it was then. "LET THE CHURCH BE FREE." It is for each age to see that it keeps the law under which the connection of Church and State is alone tenable.

But it is not true to say that there was no explanation put forth of this freedom. The Charters both of John and subsequent princes interpret it in some degree; and the practice of the times proves the rest. It meant FREEDOM IN THE ELECTION OF BISHOPS. "Know ye that we, by the grace of God, &c. . . . by the advice of our honoured Fathers and by the advice of other lieges, have in the first place granted to God and confirmed by this our present Charter for us and for our heirs for ever that the Church of England shall be free, and shall enjoy its rights and franchises entirely and fully; and that election shall be free." And at subsequent confirmations of the Charter these expressions were either repeated or more fully explained. In 9 Henry IV. we find, "Elections of all archbishoprics, bishoprics, and other dignitaries elective whatsoever shall be rendered henceforth free, without any manner

of disturbance by the Apostolic See or by commandment of our Sovereign Lord the King; provided always that our said lord the King shall have as freely his liberty and prerogative as any of his noble progenitors have had before his time." And this prerogative had been explained by 25 Edward III., which asserted that "the elections were first granted by the King's progenitors upon a certain form and condition, as to demand license of the King to choose, and then after the election to have his royal assent, and not in any other manner." And the irrevocability of this species of freedom is declared in 2 Henry VI., where it is said that "Holy Church and all the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, &c., having liberties and franchises, shall have and enjoy all their liberties and franchises well used and not repealed, nor by the Common Law repealable."

The further notice of this vexed question of Election of Bishops it will be more convenient to reserve for the next Lecture. What else did the Freedom of the Church mean? It meant also FREEDOM TO HOLD COUNCILS OR SYNODS, subject to the restriction upon the making of canons imposed by the Conqueror. It meant also FREEDOM IN THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS from secular interference, which was indeed specified in Magna Charta. And lastly it meant, what came home more practically than anything else, freedom from arbitrary taxation, the right of the clergy to meet and tax themselves. These are the main elements in that Freedom of the Church, or, strictly speaking, of the Ecclesiastical Order for the benefit of the rest, which, as far as they were assaulted, it took care to see ratified and secured at every crisis of politics. The numerous other customs and privileges included under the broad ægis of Church freedom need not be mentioned here.

The first three of these conditions of Freedom, exercised within proper limits, and guarded from all interference with civil liberty, are essential to the healthy existence of the Church. They are essential in all times and under all circumstances. They are essential in order to the proper exercise of ecclesiastical functions. They are essential to the faithful transmission of the sacred deposit. An Established Church may drag on a feeble existence without them, but at imminent risk, and under grievous depression. The last of the conditions is accidental. Yet it was the fortune of the Church of England (wisely ordered no doubt by One who can see the end) that in all alike, essential and accidental, she was hampered not only by the natural causes of difference which must always arise between Church and State, but by the action of that Roman power with which since the Conquest she had been so closely allied.

It was not only that unscrupulous princes were tempted to keep open Episcopal Sees in order to seize their revenues, or to force into them slaves and tools of their own, but they too often had a colourable pretext for such tyranny in the equally tyrannical exercise of their vast power by the Popes. How often was it a mere race of fraud and wickedness, the ancient rights of the Church and the Metropolitan having been overborne, which should carry off the spoils, the King or the Pope! How plausible must any stretch of royal power have appeared when an iniquitous system of "providing" for bishoprics and livings before they fell vacant was skilfully managed by a foreign and anti-English power, using the most subtle of all agents in this country for its own purpose! It was not only that the temporal

power was always naturally and properly jealous of any synodical action which might interfere with the laws of the land or the freedom of the subject, but the Popes had gradually seized the power of English Councils into their own hands. After the Papal Legate, long successfully resisted, had at last (in 1125) succeeded in usurping the well-ascertained and most ancient office of the Metropolitan, it was seldom that the precedent was disregarded. The repeated acts of the Legislature which at last checked, though till the Reformation they never wholly stopped, the practice, while they did a real service to the country, yet at the same time fostered a spirit which tended to the subversion of all Church discipline and all Church freedom. It was not only that the inherent impatience and dislike of statesmen to ecclesiastical freedom were excited by the spectacle of litigation in Ecclesiastical Courts, but their indignation was perpetually aroused by those constant appeals to the venal Courts of Rome which, in spite of the Constitutions of Clarendon, continued to be made up to the very time of the Reformation. It was not only that the liberty of ecclesiastical self-taxation had to struggle against the rapacity of monarchs or the exigencies of the times, but the example of tampering with it was set by the Papal Court. What more just than to argue—if you can spare money for those who are directly or indirectly assisting the national enemies, you can spare it for the national chest; if you cannot secure yourselves from the grasping avarice which many of you vehemently disapprove, you must be protected by the emptiness of your barns; you must first render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; national wealth must be taxed for national purposes?

We might well wish that all invasions of ecclesiastical liberties had been equally just, or rather that all matters of dispute between Church and State had admitted of an equally righteous method of adjustment. The act of Edward I. and his wise counsellors, by which the clergy were placed, as regards taxation, on the same footing with all other subjects of the realm, was harsh in its immediate operation, but its substantial wisdom and justice can scarcely be doubted. It was a legitimate termination of a state of things which had grown up out of the usage of times when it was of less consequence; but the Constitution was now taking shape, and the national necessities could no longer be met by the old methods: this ancient privilege was no longer tenable. From the Convocations which soon grew out of that settlement, summoned regularly, along with the newborn Representative Parliaments, for the purpose of regular instead of the old irregular self-taxation, dates the commencement of that especial form of ecclesiastical self-government which we trace down to the present day—that thread, often so slender, yet never broken, by which one at least of the essential liberties of the Church has been conveyed to our own times.*

* It may be observed here that what is called "Convocation" is held by some great authorities to be in reality a twofold assembly. That of the Southern Province is a Provincial Synod—an institution as old as the Church itself—summoned by the Archbishop (and thus always first meeting at St. Paul's for Divine Service and certain formal acts), as well as a representative Assembly of the Estate of the Clergy, meeting, according to the Edwardian settlement, along with the other Estates of the Realm, for business at Westminster. Some have advocated the separation of these two characters as an escape from the difficulties attending undue State interference, the reform of clerical representation, and the co-operation of *bonâfide* lay

For the next two centuries the Church is more or less in a state of transition. Her representatives and guardians, tenaciously clinging to Rome, become more and more out of harmony with those forces of government which are gradually gaining power. The Statutes of Richard the Second's reign evidenced the triumph of those forces; the seizure of the Alien Priories gave an ominous presage of future attacks. But her vast wealth, her firm hold on the Constitution, the affection of a large proportion of the lower class (less influenced by the heaving motions of the pre-Reformation than the middle), the support, at first perhaps from interest, and then from conscience, of the House of Lancaster, the leading position of a Chichele or a Beaufort in the State, the constant wars which distracted men's minds as well as brought political power to the Church, and above all the good solid English sense which told the nation that a Reformation, however much required, was not to be entrusted to the hands of the Lollards, kept the stately edifice erect. To the last she showed a bold front to her enemies, played them off upon one another, took advantage of their mistakes, and attempted, though with feeble hands, her own reformation. Kings, nobles, the upper classes, threw in their lot with her.

And in truth the dreaded opinions of the reforming party were not unjustly charged with the odious features of revolution, with the fanaticism of desperate men, the heresy of untaught men, leaving the ancient landmarks,

Churchmen. No opinion on this point is offered here. Time and circumstances will show. The same twofold character attaches of course to the Convocation of the Northern Province. (*Vide* Wake's 'State of the Church,' &c., p. 27.) This view is, however, disputed.

and groping their way by the light of an uninformed private judgment. Any rottenness of the old house seemed better than a deluge which would sweep all away. The wisest men trembled at that which, fixing itself in our national mind at the Lollard period, has run on without a break from those days to the present in the body politic. The same fierce spirit of resistance to all authority which distinguished John Ball from John Wiclif, and the later Lollards from the first Poor Priests, is that of which the fanatics of the seventeenth century were only one out of perpetual developments. It was necessary that a century and a half should elapse before the sterling element in the reforming party could recover itself from these degrading associations, and from a mere destructive, become a constructive, agency. Then, at last, having infused its spirit into Bohemia and Germany, and receiving thence in return, at the critical moment, the impulse itself required—chastened by persecution, and penetrated by all the electric influences of that stormy age, it was in a state to afford a handle for the grasp of one who seemed, with all his detestable vices, to be yet raised up for the special purpose of effecting the mighty change.

Never did the glory of the unreformed Church blaze higher than just before it set at the fall of Wolsey. The long delay had been of infinite service, for she was thus enabled to pass on her inheritance. Through the prolonged conflict with the pre-Reformation the relations of Church and State had suffered no material change. If anything, the expiring energies of the Plantagenets had drawn the bonds closer together; and the silent changes in the State which the first half-century of the Tudors had produced, had rather

given notes of warning than effected any severance. To the last the Church used her ancient privilege of holding Synods, and those Synods, though too late to stave off the Reformation, were growing more national and less enslaved to Rome. In matters of doctrine Parliament, though becoming so powerful, left the Church to herself. To the last the power of correcting ecclesiastical offences, however it was exercised with a shameful cruelty (and for this it is not the ecclesiastics alone who are to blame), was rigorously conserved by the Church. To the last, in spite of the temptations which Popes and clergy had themselves offered to the Crown, elections to bishoprics were free in theory, and, to some extent, though indirectly, in practice. Above all, if the deposit of the faith had received many Roman corruptions, it had, at least formally, lost nothing while in the hands of its mediæval guardians. The rust of ages had but to be rubbed off. Where anything of the status which a proper ecclesiastical constitution requires had been lost, it had been very much from the Church not keeping to her own functions. The guardians of the Church had too often encroached on the governors of the State; there had been too great a confusion between the things of Cæsar and the things of God; and there was an almost inextricable entanglement in the errors and politics of Rome. The Church was to undergo the severest trial, the most fearful purgation, to which any Church could be exposed.

In the next Lecture we shall have to note this process, and observe the final escape of the Church from the Roman connection; we shall have to examine the question whether this casket of spiritual independence, the necessary framework for the conservation of the

deposited jewel, was preserved in the new relations of Church and State introduced by the Tudors of the Reformation; or, to put it in another way, we shall have to confront the assertions of those who have allowed the boisterous tide of State Supremacy to conceal from their sight that feebler current of Church Freedom which it will be ours to trace. We shall have to watch this current, now eddying out into the broad stream, now compressed into narrow channels, often the deeper for their narrowness, yet never lost. We shall have to measure its breadth as it approaches our own times; and thus, gathering into one focus the light thrown on the relations of Church and State by all the centuries, may learn some lessons useful for ourselves as units in the great mass of British citizens, not brought into this marvellous inheritance for nothing, but with a duty to do which at least involves our making ourselves acquainted with the facts concerning it.

LECTURE IV.

THE RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED—PART II.

NOVEMBER 17, 1865.

WE are now to consider the relations of Church and State during the third period of English history, from the Reformation to the present time. We shall find these relations affected by all that had taken place previously, changed in character, yet substantially the same. If they are still to be regarded rather in the light of an alliance than of an incorporation,—if we have the same Church, with the identical Bishops, priests, and deacons for its ministers as before the Act of Submission, the same Convocation, the same Ecclesiastical Courts, the same *congé d'élire*, no more a mockery than before and no less, the same dioceses, the same cathedrals, the same parish churches, frequented for the most part by the same worshippers, the same Doctrine, as far as each was primitive, the same Liturgical offices, only purified, the same Constitutional tie between the guardians of the Church and the governors of the State,—we have at the same time, now at last, the complete triumph of the old Saxon independence of Rome, brought about mainly by that middle class which inherited with their blood the principles of their remote forefathers; we see the corruptions of the Faith shaken off which those forefathers (at least in their earlier his-

tory) never knew; we find a return to that greater simplicity of an earlier stage, carried, perhaps, in some instances to excess, but in that tendency to excess only sharing the fate of good things in all great changes; and, lastly, we have at length an end to that excessive influence in the government of the State possessed since the Conquest by great ecclesiastical officers, which was a wholly different thing from the joint action of ecclesiastics in State affairs known to the Saxon Constitution.

Great was the gain of the Reformation: yet no one ought, no one does, in the present day, speak of it as a pure gain. It is unhistorical, it is untrue, and therefore it is worse than useless, to conceal its drawbacks. It was no slight injury, however little it was the fault of the English Church, to be cut off from communion with so much of Christendom; it was no slight loss to the cause of religion that so vast an amount of monastic property should be divided between the King and his hungry courtiers, instead of being distributed for the benefit of the people through the clergy and the schools;* it was no slight evil that the clergy should lose so much ground in social rank, should be recruited from a lower class of people, and, losing the ubiquitous influence which (with manifold inconveniences and gross abuses) the monastic system gave, should have had so little means afforded them for making up the deficiency. It was no slight evil that the great National separation from Rome was only too sure to involve sectarian schism, and that the proportions of the Church should shrink from the possession of the whole, however uneasy a possession, to that only of a part, though by far the greatest part. It was

* See Coleridge on 'Church and State' for the Teutonic idea of a fund set apart for a "Clerisy."

no slight change in her political status, however necessary, that her Prelates should become, by the abstraction of the Abbots, a minority in the House of Lords, and that, by the iniquitous distribution of her property, a body of hereditary opponents to the recovery of her just rights should be raised up for her perpetual enfeeblement. Above all, it was no trifling price to pay for deliverance from a foreign usurpation that the Crown should gain a power over ecclesiastical affairs which nothing but necessity, if even that, could justify.

If the illustration used in the last Lecture may be reproduced, if State and Church are still man and wife, the same husband and the same wife, we must henceforth regard them as we should a married couple, long used to a certain well-recognized position both as to one another and their neighbours, now no longer tenable, since they have been obliged to migrate to some ruder land where the state and dignity of the wife are lost, where she has to make herself useful as a drudge, and where she loses no little of her own self-respect, though still doing that service for her imperious lord which alone keeps his household together; till at last, startled at symptoms of a growing tendency to neglect, face to face with the possibility of being turned out of doors, and wearied with making useless remonstrances, she once more stands upon her inherent, indisputable claims, counts up her losses, and deliberately pronounces that the union can only continue on the footing of a return to at least the spirit of the "Original Compact." *

* It is hoped that these expressions will not be taken to encourage a mischievous way of talking about the separation of Church and State, which has become too common of late years. These Lectures

How much light has of late been thrown on the history of Henry VIII.! And yet, though we can better fill up the picture, how exactly does he remain where he was! It was no chance medley, the meeting of the work and the instrument, of the man who was capable of shaping anew the relations of Church and State, and the Reformation to be effected. Inheriting the great position made for him by his father, combined with the advantage of not having been the heir-apparent, with every personal advantage of mind and body, taught the science of government by the ablest ecclesiastic England had seen since the days of Becket, backed by the middle and a great part of the lower classes of English society, governing a nobility thinned by the Wars of the Roses as well as cowed by the first Tudor's vigorous reign, and a hierarchy trembling at the storm now rising on all sides, seated on a throne which, through the struggle of the two Princes who were so nearly balanced, for a time arbitrated in Europe,—how exactly was such a Prince calculated to change the Constitution of a State! How could such a Prince fail to be tempted to play the tyrant!

As a tyrant there is no doubt he acted, and, if the Church felt his hand, so also did the State. His temporary stretch of the *Regale* was certainly no more unconstitutional than his obliging his subjects to allow his Proclamations the force of Laws. But surely of all his public acts there was none which will less bear inspection than that which has given its shape and form to the relations of Church and State from that

are based on an ample recognition of the extreme importance of the connection of Church and State, and, by a reference to history, they attempt to point out the true method of retaining that connection.

day to the present. That the king who had himself sanctioned and forwarded the holding of a Synod by Wolsey as Papal Legate, should turn round, and having caught the whole clergy in his trap, should use the law of the land against them, urging the penalties of a Præmunire till he had reduced them to make the Submission he himself dictated, is one of the most tyrannical deeds on record.* But we are not concerned here to award praise or blame to particular monarchs; we are only to trace the consequences of their acts. Yet let us not forget what we noticed in the previous Lecture. If we cannot excuse the King, we must remember it was the Popes who had first set him the example of trampling on the rights of the National Church.

The Act of Submission freed the Church from Rome. In that Act everything required for the purpose was bound up. But it did something more. It tied the Church to the Crown in a manner which if it had not been subsequently explained, and practices founded on it modified, would have gone far to ruin her position as a true Church. It is, however, quite unworthy of fair-minded men to judge the Reformed Church of England by all the violent proceedings of Henry. As steps to an end let them be marked. There are, indeed, some of them which it would be well if we remembered better. But the true aspect of the new relations of the Crown to the Church must be looked for in the settlement made by Queen Elizabeth, after the violent fluctuations of the first turbulent years of the

* Hallam admits that "Henry's prosecution of the Church on this occasion was extremely harsh and unfair."—'Constitutional History of England,' chap. ii.

Reformation had subsided. By the Articles of her reign alone are Churchmen bound as to the Royal Supremacy; and the explanation of the prerogative contained there need bring no blush to their cheeks. This explicit renunciation of all offensive interpretations of the Oath of Supremacy left the position of the Church open indeed to assault, but it was not at all objectionable if taken in the sense intended. If the strangeness of the new position scarcely suffered her at first to move freely, the essential forms of freedom were at least retained; and thus an opening was left for expansion when the proper time should arrive.

And, in fact, the evils of her fettered condition were not materially felt so long as the crown was on the head of princes who knew their duty, and felt their responsibility. Mary's melancholy reign may be put aside as exceptional; but it has been often remarked that the Tudor sovereigns and the early Stuarts had at least this merit, that they would allow no one to touch the Church but themselves. With the Church they stood or fell. Their Coronation by the Archbishop was to them profoundly significant. And, if it is not easy to understand how Magna Charta, with all its stately guarantees of Church freedom, could be reconciled with all the acts of the Tudor Supremacy, the plea of necessity carried them over all: a tyrant's plea, to be sure; but the nation preferred its own to foreign tyrants. It is the only and the true ground of defence for all parties concerned in the new settlement of the Church. We may not condone individual acts of rapacity or violence, we must condemn the wholesale robberies, the judicial murders, the bitter persecutions, of that terrible period; but we may surely perceive

that nothing short of a series of able and strong-willed sovereigns, taking the interests of the Church into their own hands, could, humanly speaking, have carried her through the perils of the times. They alone saved this country from religious wars like those of France, from a return to Popery on the one hand, from a Genevan settlement on the other. Not that these sovereigns must be thought of as acting single-handed: beyond doubt they had the better sense of clergy and people with them; but they had the will and the power necessary to give the victory to that better sense, to the opinions of that moderate party, which but for them, in the mad conflict of opinion, must assuredly have gone to the wall. English Churchmen may very easily lose sight of the dangers from which they have been preserved in a too narrow criticism of the acts of their preservers. There is an old proverb against speaking ill of the bridge which has carried one over.

We have said that the essential characteristics of the Church's freedom were preserved in the transition. Let us examine this a little further.

1. There was no pretence of taking the judgment of ecclesiastical matters away from the clergy, or of preventing the Church from declaring when necessary what that truth was which she was founded in order to hand down. "If the cause be spiritual, secular Courts do not meddle with it;" "We may refuse to answer before any civil judge in a matter which is not civil." So writes Hooker,* the recognized exponent of Tudor Church and State. There was no thought of stretching the Supremacy beyond this. The Crown

* Hooker, viii. 8, 9.

was to see justice done by ecclesiastics in the Ecclesiastical Courts. The Crown in the last resort was to hear appeals from the Archbishop's Court, those appeals which, though temporarily stopped by the Constitutions of Clarendon, used, up to this time, to go to Rome; and it heard them through Delegates chosen by the Lord Chancellor.* Now, as the appeal could no longer go to Rome, it must vest somewhere; and so long as the Delegates were faithfully selected, with a view to mere cases of ordinary discipline, a good deal might be said for this COURT OF APPEAL.† It was probably only intended as a temporary arrangement, and was no doubt liable to abuse, yet for a long period it was not abused. But the great point is that it went side by side with the active existence of Convocation, regularly sitting, and acknowledged as the proper Court for questions of doctrine. From that august tribunal there was no appeal; for to it lay the Appeal in causes where the King was himself concerned,‡ and in its hands on more than one occasion we all know that even the imperious Henry found it convenient to lodge his cause.

As far then as the Ecclesiastical Courts went, we are not in the least obliged to admit that the Royal Supremacy, as established by the Tudors, interfered with the freedom of the Church. The Crown decided no ecclesiastical questions itself, but only through its proper Constitutional agents. The language put into the

* 25 Hen. VIII.

† See Sir Robert Phillimore's paper read at the Norwich Church Congress.

‡ 24 Hen. VIII. See Joyce's 'Civil Power in its Relations to the Church,' chap. iii.

mouth of the Sovereign, in the Preface to the Articles, shews a clear appreciation of the Church's rights, or, as expressed at the last revision, "a princely care that the Churchmen may do the work which is proper unto them." The deterioration of the Court of Delegates commenced, however, early, and progressed rapidly; though it was reserved for our own times to combine in one almost every possible objection which can lie against such a Court.* It will be seen at once that

* "In the year 1833 it was enacted that all causes coming to the King in Council should be tried by a Committee, to be composed of at least four out of a number of persons of whom all must be laymen; a very small proportion only could be civilians; none of the rest, except the Lord Chancellor, need be members of the Church of England. Nay, the Court might actually be composed in any given case of persons holding their offices during the pleasure of the Crown, that is to say, of the minister of the day." "It is vain to lay stress upon the unmeaning arrangement for the presence of Bishops at the hearing of such a case (the trial of doctrine) which has been unduly embellished with the name of assessorship. For, first, they are few in number; secondly, so many other qualities are of necessity to be regarded in the choice of Archbishops, and likewise in filling the See of London, that the three persons who are officially Privy Councillors can very rarely be the best theologians on the Episcopal Bench; thirdly, their presence is not required by law; fourthly, they are no assessors at all, having no defined function, and need not, when present, be consulted at all, or may be consulted on the small points and not on the large ones; fifthly, the whole system of such consultation is secret and irregular, and in the highest degree irresponsible, and no blessing can be expected to flow from it. Here then we have arrived at a plain and gross violation of the principle recited in the preamble of the 24th Henry VIII., that the spirituality, according to the constitution of the realm of England, administered the law spiritual, as the temporalty administered the law temporal; the principle declared by Lord Coke, that the king administers his ecclesiastical laws by his ecclesiastical judges, a principle of universal application, but of the most especial and vital application, it need hardly be observed, in the trial of doctrine. And thus I arrive at

nothing said here applies to that temporary abuse of the Supremacy, the High Commission Court, which, neither in its constitution nor its proceedings, we are in any way concerned to defend.

2. We come next to CONVOCATION. This vital portion of the framework of Church freedom was, as a matter of course, retained at the Reformation. There was no attempt to deprive the clergy of their stated meetings; their sessions are an unbroken series; there is no such gap as some suppose between the sessions previous to the Reformation and subsequent to it. It was the same essential part of the Constitution as before; self-taxation by the clergy was as much the necessary order of things; every ancient usage and formality was kept up as tenaciously as ever. The Act of Submission did not affect its character, though it left the door open to abuses. The Archbishop still summoned and prorogued it. The arrangements concerning it were but a return, in most respects, to those of the Conqueror. It was only the Conqueror's law for which kings had so long been con-

the answer to my second question proposed at the outset, namely this, that the present composition of the appellate tribunal, with regard to causes of doctrine, is unreasonable, unconstitutional, and contrary to the spirit of the Reformation Statutes." "Lord Brougham has declared from his own recollection that cases of heresy were not taken into view at all on the passing of the Act of 1833."—Mr. Gladstone, 'On the Royal Supremacy,' pp. 78, 79, 80. Published in 1850; reprinted, by his permission, in 1865 (Parkers). See also Fuller, 'On the Court of Final Appeal' (Parkers).

Thus the present Court of Final Appeal is not only open to the objections so unanswerably urged by the Church, but it is actually the result of a mistake, an accident, an oversight! (Surely a hundredth part of the attention given to Cattle Plague or Railway Bills, might turn this Court into something which would be satisfactory to the nation at large as well as the Church.)

tending against Popes which prevented the passing of Canons into the law of the land without Royal permission. That Convocation should only meet when summoned by the King was not only in the spirit of the Constitution, but it was, *like all the other defences of the Royal Supremacy*, a necessary bulwark for the time against Rome. In this particular, Convocation was only in the same condition as Parliament, to which it almost exactly corresponded. The post-Reformation Convocation was in fact the recognized ecclesiastical Parliament. "It was the supreme Court for the trial of doctrine: it might correct or depose offenders; might examine and censure heretical works; might, after having obtained the royal license, make and publish Canons; might, with the consent of Parliament, alter the Liturgy; and in short transact all business of an ecclesiastical character."* In this Convocation there was always one guarantee of independence, the negative on the proceedings of the Upper House possessed by the Lower. This might lead, and has led, to complications; but it is easy to see how the overweening influence of the Crown, or of mere political Bishops, might in this way be checked.†

The inherent independence of the Church on this side was then sufficiently preserved in form by the Tudor princes. The danger of the new Royal Supremacy began to show itself when unconstitutionally worked: when the Crown was advised to omit the

* Lathbury, 'On Convocation,' chap. v.

† The Act of Submission applied to the Assembly technically known as Convocation; it has been questioned whether it affected the Archbishop's independent power of summoning his Provincial Synod or Council.

summons of the Ecclesiastical Parliament, or, if summoned, to prevent the passing of Canons which did not conflict with the laws and customs of the realm, and which were demanded by the united voice of the Church.

3. It flows from the last heading, but must be mentioned as a separate mark of the independence of the Reformed Church, and the more because so many mistakes are made on the subject, that she had FREE LIBERTY TO REFORM HER OWN LITURGY, AND TO DECLARE IN HER OWN FORM THE ARTICLES OF THE FAITH. After the first wild convulsions of Henry's will had spent themselves, Cranmer, Ridley, and their coadjutors, had the work entrusted to their hands. The reign of Edward VI., short and troubled as it was, was yet long enough to give us the inestimable privilege of our Book of Common Prayer, sanctioned by Church and State. The proceedings at the opening of Elizabeth's reign were the almost unanimous return of the nation to that of which it had been illegally deprived by Mary. No alterations have since been made in the Prayer Book of any material consequence, and where slight changes have been introduced, Convocation has first passed them, then Parliament.* The Articles, though our princes were seriously and most intelligently interested in their formation, or re-enactment, were none the less the free work of the clergy. The King and the laity in Parliament only ratified and sanctioned the Articles; they did not meddle with them. Thus the Church was permitted to settle all her formularies, establish all her reforms of ritual, and make all necessary concessions to Nonconformists, during the

* See Wheatly, 'On the Book of Common Prayer.' Appendix to the Introductory Discourse.

time when she was in the fittest state to do the work, before she was raised too high by the policy which Laud represented, or depressed too low by that of which Walpole may be taken as the exponent. Thus she retained the full amount of primitive *truth* without sacrificing her inheritance of Apostolical *order*.

4. The ELECTION OF BISHOPS, if not free in practice, was as free as in Roman times, and at least retained the form of freedom. If the Bishops of the Reformed Church are accused of servility, the old observation should be remembered that a Bonner took out the same Commission from Henry VIII. as a Cranmer from Edward VI. The ancient form, known as the *congé d'élire*, of which the Church was for a short time deprived, was soon restored and still exists. "The *congé d'élire*," says an old writer, "is still kept up in England, though to no other purpose than to show the ancient right of the Church to elect her own Bishops, and may one day prove a handle to recover it." As however there is no doubt that the *congé d'élire* has been a contradiction in terms for many an age, this may be the place for the briefest inquiry how far this practical denial of the inherent right of the Church, secured by Magna Charta, and acknowledged in form, is a bar to the claim of independence.

So brief an inquiry must proceed on the assertion, which students of history will acknowledge requires no proof, that this claim of the State to appoint or nominate, or at least sanction or confirm the appointment of, Bishops, has been made in all ages, in all branches of the Church, and within all countries. It is not in the least peculiar to England. The popular Election and the Confirmation by the Metropolitan with

which the Church started in her career began practically to fall, but only occasionally, into the hands of the Emperor soon after State-connection commenced. The Emperor, as representing the people, was often applied to by the Church in great cities in order to escape from the turbulence of popular elections in troubled times. "Before the fall of the Empire," says Guizot, "the Bishops were elected by the clergy and the people. The Emperor only interfered in rare cases, in the election for the most considerable towns."* But in the exercise of this occasional and exceptional† function there was a very decided understanding between both parties. As was remarked in the former Lecture, the adhesion of the Emperor to Orthodoxy was (after the fourth century) a law. Church and State were in harmony. Each performed its own function—often jarring no doubt in the best of times, but with substantial justice on both sides: the State protecting the Synods, and lending its support to the laws of the Church, the Church supporting the Government in all lawful matters, and lending its all-powerful aid in every relation of social life to the cause of order and obedience.

As time went on, and in the Eastern Roman Empire primitive purity decayed, the Emperors interfered on this point more constantly. The position gradually

* 'Hist. de la Civilisation en France.' 12me Leçon.

† That the Emperors acted in this matter only occasionally and exceptionally is not a mere matter of antiquarian interest for English Churchmen: for in the explanation of the Royal Supremacy given in the Second Canon, the authority of "Christian Emperors of the primitive Church" in ecclesiastical causes is expressly referred to as the model on which our Sovereigns' Supremacy was framed, and of course it must have an equal weight in regard of this particular part of the *Regale*.

taken up by the Emperors was that they had the right of sanctioning or confirming those who were nominated by the clergy of the see, and already confirmed by the Metropolitan—a right which secured them a veto on all appointments. But the notion of absolute power in the matter was not present. We shall not be misrepresenting the convictions of the age when we say that the inherent rights of the Church, the sacred tie, the spiritual relation, between a Bishop and his flock, were too well understood to admit of such an idea. The whole respect of a people for their pastor, at least all that was worth having, was too clearly seen to hang upon a well-recognized distinction between the civil and the ecclesiastical power. The true interests of the State would have been not only weakened, but the advantage derived from the Church—far greater than the Church ever derived from the State—would have been entirely lost if the people once began to believe that religion was a mere State-craft, their Bishops mere State-officers. They could no longer have respected such a religion, and the whole foundations of society would have been loosened. And in fact as this principle of true respect for the Church declined, as the Emperors pushed their power over it further and further, that loosening of the foundations of society became more apparent. The later ages of Byzantine history will scarcely be quoted except for warning. In its prolonged decrepitude this particular abuse obtained almost the dignity of a law, for every symptom of independent political life had disappeared; the carcase of the State alone was left, and "the eagles were gathered together." Little was left the Church but her Faith.*

* See above, p. 93.

In the early days of the barbaric kingdoms of Western Europe, as soon as they were once fairly converted, and while Christian teaching was yet fresh, the orthodoxy of the Church was in little danger; but in the matter of elections the anarchy of the times soon affected the relations of Church and State. M. Guizot has thus summed up the facts of the case during the first period of these kingdoms:—"The Churches were wealthy; the barbaric kings made them a means of recompensing their servants and enriching themselves. In numerous instances they directly nominate the Bishops. The Church protests; she claims the election; she does not always succeed therein; many Bishops are retained in the Sees where they have been placed by the kings alone. Still the fact is not changed into a matter of right, and continues to pass for an abuse. The kings themselves admit this on many occasions. The Church by degrees regains the election; but she also gives way in her turn. She grants that after the election the confirmation by the king is necessary. The Bishop who formerly took possession of his See from the time that he was consecrated by the Archbishop, now ascends not his throne until he has obtained the sanction of royalty. Such is not only the fact, but the religious and civil law." *

Charlemagne, who left his mark on most things, gave fixity to this system, at least in theory.† In him was gathered up all the past; in him met all Teutonic, all Roman elements, hitherto so inharmoniously mingled; and from him, stamped with his mark, they descended

* 'La Civilisation en France.' 12me Leçon.

† Capitulary of the year 803. Quoted by Neander in 'Church History,' Stebbing's translation, vol. v. p. 122.

into the constitution of the modern kingdoms formed out of his Empire. The trust reposed by their subjects in the monarchs of these kingdoms, and exercised by those monarchs in that branch of the *Regale* which gave them the right of Confirmation of Bishops, was fully acknowledged by themselves to be a trust. The Clergy as guardians of the Church kept their full share of influence through the Nomination. The direct voice of the Laity was the element which had disappeared during the transition from ancient to modern times; but it would be wrong to make light of the indirect influence they exerted, an influence perhaps more really effective in the long run because less dependent on varying times and circumstances; and this influence was nó doubt exceedingly powerful while the Church, however corrupt and internally divided, was as yet unbroken by schisms. England itself received no small amount of political legacy both as to Church and State from Charlemagne. But the peculiar relations of Saxon Church and State were more favourable to some sort of independence on the point of episcopal elections than they were abroad.* If the Witan did not always appoint—for we know the King often appointed—it did so frequently; and the Bishops in the Witan seem to have managed ecclesiastical affairs pretty much as they wished.†

* Neander as above.

† It is scarcely necessary to quote the numerous authors of late years whose researches into Anglo-Saxon history have thrown light upon these points. The substantial agreement of two competent writers, opposed to one another in principles, will be sufficient to establish it. Soames (in his 'History of the Anglo-Saxon Church,' p. 149) says: "In that see (Canterbury) without even the *form* of a reference to Rome, was vested a control over episcopal vacancies.

The confusion which succeeded upon the failure of Charlemagne's wonderful attempt to organize a world gave free scope to those struggles upon Episcopal appointments which perpetually afflicted the disorganized States which had composed his Empire. The grand appointment of all, the Papacy, afforded the central and typical instance of the general struggle. When the Emperor was powerful enough to exercise a real influence in the appointment of a Pope, the appointments were respectable; when too feeble to affect the election, that election fell under the control of corrupt local influences, and appointments became unspeakably bad.

On the death of their prelate the principal inhabitants of a diocese, both clerical and lay, elected a successor. This individual was presented to his Metropolitan, and on consecration he was required to swear canonical obedience to no other."

And Lingard, in his 'History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church,' p. 91, says: "By Theodore the discipline of the Saxon Church was reduced to a more perfect form. Under him and his immediate successors the appointment of Bishops was generally made in the National Synods, in which the Primate presided, and at which the deputies of the vacant Church attended to give their consent." (This "attendance of deputies" seems, however, to lack evidence.) Lingard then shows how corrupt practices began to creep in on the part of Kings, Bishops, and clergy generally; and says that "in historical records of the ninth and tenth centuries the appointment is sometimes described as made by the unfettered choice of the clergy and people; sometimes as proceeding solely from the absolute will of the sovereign." "The probability is that both were conjoined; that the recommendation of the prince operated as a command; while the choice of the clergy was a mere form preliminary to the confirmation and consecration of the prelate elect. Thus it was certainly under our native kings, the descendants of Egbert, who, however, appear to have disposed of the most important sees in National Councils with the consent of the Bishops and Earldormen; but under Canute and his successors the will of the King was notified in a more imperious manner."

The degradation of the Papacy in Carlovingian times belongs to a page which Christendom may wish blotted from its annals. When order revived in the persons of the German Emperors, order revived also at Rome, but soon took a form, as regards the Papal appointment, unknown to earlier periods. A direct Nomination by the Emperor, and that a Nomination exercised in favour of his own countrymen, became the rule. The same principle was more and more openly extended to other ecclesiastical appointments. So violent a bending of the old rule of compromise in one direction could not fail to bring on a corresponding violence from the opposite side; and the War of Investitures was the result. The secular and non-secular principles in the relations of Church and State were now for the first time brought into serious conflict on a great scale. Heroic men on either side fought out a battle which deluged Europe with blood for half a century. Each party had much to allege on its own behalf, but, till each was exhausted, neither could see its way back to the compromise from which both had departed, and to which at length both returned. The feudal ceremonial of the times, and the developed state of the Papacy, did indeed dictate the peculiar terms of the new agreement, but the substance was the same as that which had existed in the Roman and the Franco-Roman Empire. The Pope was to invest with the ring and staff (in the case of an Archbishop with the crozier); the Emperor was to receive homage for the temporalities. From that day to this there has always been exactly the same need of just such a compromise. Putting the Metropolitan, or the Bishops of the province, or the Diocesan Synod of Clergy and Laity, or

the independent Church in some form or other, for the Pope, the Election should come through that channel; the revenues, the State position, from the Crown. Translated into modern language, if the State chooses the Bishop, it should be a choice amongst those presented for choice by the Church.

To the compromise effected in the twelfth century must be traced what we now see around us. Rome became the standing example of the clergy-elected Bishop; and the Popes, freed from the direct, though not from the indirect, influence of secular princes, became competitors with those princes for a share in the election of every Bishop in every Western State. This, though indeed the letter of the compact, seriously interfered in practice with the working of the principle of the compromise. As the battle had been fought under the leadership of the Popes, so the result was found to be in their favour, not in that of the National Churches which had supported them. Like the dwarf in the alliance with the giant, the national forces gained much honour, but little solid result. The principle of ecclesiastical independence in regard of elections was indeed preserved, but it was represented by a foreign Bishop; and thus its force, from the growing estrangement between Rome and the nations, was seriously impaired. Still, even in spite of so great a disadvantage, the ecclesiastical power, both in this country and on the Continent, was sufficiently strong to protest against, and, on the whole, offer a certain dogged resistance to, the arbitrary will of kings: the confirmation or sanction of the appointment of Bishops was all that was technically granted them. In numerous cases the Church struggled against improper appointments,

and at least kept the notion of her veto alive. She was in fact backed up by the public opinion of the State at large, and in many instances found pious kings or powerful ecclesiastical statesmen to take her part.

It is here indeed that we are to look for an answer to the question we have proposed. If from a variety of causes, growing not only out of the ever-present facts of human nature, but out of mistakes on all sides in the past, the rights of the Church in the election of her chief Pastors have been overborne,—has the "unwritten law" of the Church, has the public opinion of the Church laity, been strong enough to compel the respect of the governing power? Has she practically retained a veto of which she may appear to have been deprived? Have her indirect influences really prevailed on the whole? If we apply this test to the system of Episcopal appointments under the Tudor princes, it may be said that the Church was practically free even here at the most critical period of her history, and in the most delicate of all relations to the State. The *Regale* was in the nature of things somewhat more tightly pressed than before, but as a compensation the necessity under which the Tudor and early Stuart princes lay to preserve the discipline of that Church in which they had embarked their fortunes, obliged them to choose on the whole the men of whom the Church approved. This moral guarantee, which left so much to the capricious will of monarchs, was indeed a bad exchange for the ancient usage; but it was not new at the Reformation, and at least the *form* of freedom was retained—an inestimable thing to save in any State, because the form can always be clothed with life; but most of all in our own, where precedents are never too antiquated, the

hopes of reform never so favourable as when that reform can be based on laws still existing, though not carried into act. Two of our post-Reformation sovereigns have attempted of their own accord to rectify the almost universal abuse of the Royal power in appointing Bishops. "King James I. used this method in Scotland, that when any Bishop died, the Archbishop convened his fellow Bishops, and they gave in to the King the names of three persons whom they judged most fit, out of whom the King chose one into the vacant See."* And King William III., "soon after the loss of his Queen, was induced to appoint a Commission, consisting of the six most distinguished Prelates on the Bench, who were to recommend fit persons to supply all vacant Bishoprics, Deaneries, and other preferments, as well as Headships and Professorships of the two Universities in the Royal patronage." †

We may then say that on all the four cardinal points which must be taken as guarantees and bulwarks of the independence of the Church, viz., ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS, SYNODS, REGULATION OF DOCTRINAL AND LITURGICAL FORMS, and THE ELECTION OF BISHOPS, the Reformed Church started on her course substantially free, or at least as much so as she was in Roman times. Her relations with the State were only changed in form, and that form was in the main a recurrence to an earlier state of things. The change in short was made on Constitutional principles, though some of the temporary acts by which it was effected were arbitrary enough. The precautions taken at the Reformation were in in-

* Leslie's 'Case of the Regale,' Works, folio, p. 677.
† Monk's 'Life of Bentley,' p. 108, 1st edit.

tention, however they might be afterwards twisted, rather *anti-Papal* than *pro-Regal*.*

We have spoken of the danger to which the Church was exposed by the Act of Submission, and by the consequent stricter connection with the Crown, and therefore exposure to the caprice of particular monarchs. It was not only this. Relations which were tolerable under certain conditions might become intolerable when the conditions were altered. For good or for evil the Church was for the future far more concerned in the vicissitudes of the Sovereign than before; and as that Sovereign's place altered with the course of time, so the relations of the Church with the altered State would require an alteration which she might or might not be strong enough at the moment to gain. And we must further add that her own external power to command attention was enormously diminished. However overgrown, or rather irregularly developed, that power had, previously to the Reformation, been, the Church has never since that time been able to expand herself in full proportion to the wants of the people.

Between the Reformation and the Restoration there was no definite change in the relations of the two powers to one another. The Church had indeed to undergo the extremes of elevation and depression within that period. Raised out of her proper position by the mistaken policy of the two elder Stuarts,

* "To sum up the whole, then, I contend that the Crown did not (at the Reformation) claim by Statute either to be of right or to become by convention the source of that kind of action which was committed by the Saviour to the Apostolic Church, whether for the enactment of laws or for the administration of its discipline."—Gladstone, 'On the Supremacy,' p. 21, as cited above.

and exiled for a time with their successor, when restored with the Sovereign she came back to a country which had passed through an immense change. But until that time, though for a while dormant, her relations with the State remained as they were fixed by the Tudor compact. The Sovereigns of this period were, with scarce an exception, the nurses and friends of the Church. They only erred, the later of them, in attempting to govern the State by her agency. The weakness of the hold which the first James and Charles felt they possessed on the Government led them to lean on that which has always failed when used improperly. The nation, freed from the strong arm of the Tudors, and gathering each year fresh political strength against the Crown, could no longer put up with Tudor government from Stuart hands. Those who could not understand the signs of the times had to succumb to the shock. The Church, the Sovereign, and in the end the whole nation, had each its lesson to learn. The Church had to learn, that if, before the Reformation, the government of a people by ecclesiastics was almost intolerable, it was quite so afterwards; and that she might well be satisfied if she could but secure fair play along with the legitimate means for her proper development. The Sovereign had to learn the limits of his prerogative, and that he could no longer rely on one branch of the Constitution at the expense of the rest. The people had to learn that whatever they might have had to suffer at the hands of ecclesiastics, it was as nothing compared to what they had to endure from the Church's enemies; and that for the future they must watch Church, King, Lords and Commons, alike; the only safety for all being that each should keep its due

place. Coke had already laid down the law, and with something of a prophetic spirit, in these words:—"And certain it is that this kingdom hath been best governed and peace and quiet preserved when both parties, that is, the justices of the temporal courts and the ecclesiastical judges, have kept themselves within their proper jurisdiction, without encroaching or usurping one upon another; and when such encroachment or usurpation have been made, they have been the seeds of great trouble and inconvenience." *

At the Restoration, Church and State seemed to start afresh, with the old Constitution more firmly founded on the goodwill of the people than ever. But few knew at that time how great a change had taken place during the last twenty years, or could guess how short was to be the duration of the happy prospect with which they set out. It would have been impossible, even under a better king than Charles, to return in all points to the ancient condition of England. The old feudal landmarks were of necessity swept away at once, and the state of things under which we are now living took their place. Silently and unobserved, one important outwork of the Church vanished into the past. Taxation was to undergo an entire change, a process of centralization; the clergy were to relinquish their most ancient privilege of taxing themselves. They had scarcely any choice in the matter; they made no remonstrance; they seem not to have foreseen the natural consequence, but that consequence was most momentous. Convocation lost its chief guarantee for a place in the Constitution. There was no longer now the same cogent reason for summoning it as before; and the kings who

* Fourth Institute, c. 74.

would have summoned it for Church purposes had passed away.

With a profligate monarch, whose heart, so far as he had one, was at Rome, and "who so plainly showed that he considered religion a farce that he could not properly be called a hypocrite," a Court as bad, of course, as its king, a people relapsing by force of reaction into licentiousness, the Church, after the banishment of Clarendon, went through a period of trial only less afflicting than when she suffered with her murdered sovereign. But she had learnt her lesson; and if she often lost the support of those to whom her defence was entrusted, she gained that affection amongst the people which she has, as far as she has reached them, retained ever since. Her inner life also was illustrated by great Divines: the best type of laymen arose within her pale. Izaac Walton, and Browne, and Boyle, and Evelyn, and Nelson, were but specimens of a class of men which adversity had bred. Thus before the suspension of her self-government had time to develop its injurious effects, her rights and interests had been safely lodged with the town and country parishes, the halls and cottages of the entire realm. Her rights were indeed recorded in plain language, for, in the first money-bill by which the clergy were taxed along with the laity, a clause was inserted to the effect that "nothing herein contained shall be drawn into example to the prejudice of the ancient rights belonging to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and clergy of this realm." But the rights, however protected in words, were not used in fact. Grievances were now unredressed because the sense of justice was no longer quickened by the want of money. Some slight compensation had, it is true, been gained by the vote for Mem

bers of Parliament now first placed in the power of the clergy; but the voice of the Church, which, by the Constitution, should be constantly heard, was silent; her influence, which, by the nature of the case, ought to be publicly exerted for the good of all, was paralyzed. The rulers of the land cared little enough for the State, but for the Church still less;* and her relations to the State, thus mutilated by the unconstitutional suspension of her Synods, were not readjusted. Can it be said that they have been properly readjusted since those days?

The Restoration period brought into prominence the new difficulties with which, though without any diminution of the old, the relations of Church and State had henceforward to contend. Nonconformity—to use the most comprehensive word—never, after its defeat at the Restoration, really recovered itself; but it was still a political power. The Church, in an evil day, lent herself to Parliament for the purpose of keeping in subjection what Parliament, speaking the voice of the great mass of Englishmen, felt to be the common enemy. Something may be said for the Test Act; its policy must not be judged from the nineteenth-century point of view; men were blinded with fear lest the perils of the past should recur: if the Establishment were to prevail, perhaps it could only at that time be secured at that price;† but there can be no doubt that the future position of the Church was grievously weakened by the close alliance she was thus forced to make with a Government about to become year by year less friendly to her real interests. With Romanism in high places

* Charles II. has, however, at least the merit of making good ecclesiastical appointments.

† See Bishop Warburton's defence of the Test Act.

and ever imminent on one side, with Dissent, on the other, strong enough to be used as a political tool by the hand of power, with a Latitudinarian school springing up within herself, her danger was great; yet, through her firm hold on the mass of the people, she was enabled, surely we may say by God's Providence, to hand down at least the traditions of her rights, along with her unchanged faith, through the darkness of the next century. Sometimes, indeed, she was even able to claim the exercise of those rights.

The hold she had on the people taught the world a lesson in the reign of James II. From the Church came the political salvation of the country. The Universities, and, notably, Oxford, gave the first impulse to the national resistance. The trial of the Seven Bishops was the rallying cry of a realm. Its significance could not be ignored. Statesmen might feel little gratitude for the services thus rendered by the Church, but they learnt her power. They shaped their course accordingly. It became their policy to sap her influence, to play off parties within herself against one another, to withhold her rights and privileges as far as they dared, to teach her to forget her independence.

As the Church bore her full share in the Revolution of 1688, the Compact between Church and State was now more solemnly ratified than before. The Coronation Oath was fixed as it now stands,—a solemn record of the monarch's obligation to the Church, and the Church's Parliament was duly summoned to consider the ecclesiastical state of the realm. Thus, after a long interval, we find Convocation again exercising its proper functions on the important question to which the King was pledged, the Comprehension of Dissenters. We are not about to discuss that question; but it falls into our

plan to observe that the Session of Convocation made it at once apparent that the Revolution had not diminished the difficulties of the Church. It had in fact added another of no small magnitude. The secession of the Non-jurors not only carried off from the Church some of the ablest and most devoted men, the very men most wanted at this critical juncture, but also bequeathed a political taint to what they left behind. If the new King were to continue on the throne, he had (at first at any rate) but little choice in the matter of Convocation. The political condition of England was too critical; it would not, as a matter of fact, bear the strain of an opposition to Government within that body. Thus the continuance of the practice of the preceding Kings—those Kings who so ill performed their duty either to Church or State—was only too fairly excused. It was ten years before Convocation sat again.

And so for the second time the proper independence of the Church suffered from political causes external to herself. We have seen that the usurpations of the Papacy had forced her into a questionable position with regard to the Crown, and, though her rights had never been repudiated, that the freedom of their exercise had in the course of time been impaired. The affection of a large portion of her members to the exiled family was now to offer a similar impediment. But the purely accidental character of both grounds of restriction is of itself the best possible proof of the essentially just character of her claims. It is obvious that when the political accidents had passed away, when the repression of Constitutional rights which temporary necessity had brought about could no longer be said to be required, then the normal state of things returned. To continue impositions, which a just dread of Rome at one time,

and a justifiable dread of Jacobitism at another, had produced, up to periods when Roman and Jacobite political power had ceased to exist, was more than injustice; it was tyranny. It was a policy as short-sighted as tyrannical; for the Church's deprivation of her rights could not but re-act upon the State: and it did re-act. Yet it has been reserved for our own times to perceive and to attempt to redress the wrong.

But before we speak of the Georgian era, we must notice how, in the circumstances of that agitated period which preceded the final suppression of Convocation, out of evil came forth good.

The Jacobite leaven working among Churchmen no doubt added to the activity of those who, towards the close of William's reign, effected the temporary revival of Convocation, but it did not create the spirit which gave them the victory. There was a vehement feeling of indignation throughout the country at the suspension of the Church's Synods in that reign, and the controversy it evoked has produced monuments of learning on the question from which all subsequent times have drawn. It will be enough in this Lecture to mention the three works to which every one who wishes to understand the controversy must refer.

The celebrated 'Letter to a Convocation Man' aroused the whole nation. It was probably written by Sir Bartholomew Shower, and is short, pithy, vigorous, and eloquent.* The next was the far more elaborate work of one whose busy presence we find from first to last during the movement.

* Mr. Lathbury quotes the 'Atterbury Correspondence' in favour of Dr. Binkes, but his references fail to bear out his view. He is no doubt right in repudiating Atterbury's authorship of the paper. (Lathbury on 'Convocation,' p. 344.)

Atterbury's 'Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation,' followed up the first blow. So ably, so vehemently did he follow it up, that it was once said that though truth might be with Wake (his great antagonist), the appearance of it was with Atterbury.* These two works produced the revival of Convocation. The third work to which reference has been made is Wake's 'State of the Church and Clergy of England.' It is not the first of that great author's treatises on the subject, but it is his greatest and most matured production, exhausting every notice of English Synods from the earliest times to his own. He and Atterbury were no unworthy combatants. But it should be observed that they do not differ so much as is sometimes supposed. The controversy is often spoken of as one of principle. It was only a difference of detail. Wake contended for a greater power in the Crown as to summoning Convocation than Atterbury admitted, and for a greater power of action in the Upper House, but his general conclusions on the claims of the Church are as decided as his opponent's, and his distress at the suppression of Convocation no less pronounced. These are his words, the words of the champion of the *Regale*, the favourite of the Court, the future Archbishop: "Should we be ever so unhappy under a Christian magistrate as to be denied all liberty of these assemblies, though the governors and fathers of the Church should with all their care and interest endeavour to obtain it—should he so abuse his prerogative as to turn it not only to the detriment but to the ruin of all true religion and morality among us—in such case of extremity I have before said, and still adhere to it, that the

* Quoted by Lathbury, 'History of Convocation,' p. 393.

bishops and pastors of the Church must resolve to hazard all in the discharge of their duty." *

An extract or two from the famous 'Letter to a Convocation Man' above mentioned, may not at this point of our survey be unacceptable. "In plain English," says the author, writing in 1697, "I think if ever there was need of a Convocation since Christianity was established in this kingdom, there is need of one now; when such an open looseness in men's principles and practices, and such a settled contempt of religion and the priesthood, have prevailed everywhere, when heresies of all kinds, when scepticism, deism, and atheism itself, overrun us like a deluge, when the Mosaic history has, by men of your own order, been cunningly undermined and exposed under pretence of explaining it . . . . when all mysteries in religion have been decried as impositions on men's understandings, and nothing is admitted as an article of faith but what we can fully and perfectly comprehend. . . . . There is need of it to give a check to the further proceeding of these loose and pernicious opinions, or if that cannot be done, yet at least to remove the scandal which their growth and impunity have brought upon this Church and Nation. A Convocation seems necessary not only for the sake of the faith and doctrine of our English Church, but even to preserve the faith of any Revelation." "If after all it should be pretended that the proper way of redressing these mischiefs and grievances is by Parliament . . . . to this it may be replied . . . . that such a method is in the nature of the thing improper. 'Tis a little too much to suppose country gentlemen, merchants, or lawyers, to be most skilled in

* 'State of the Church,' &c., p. 86. See the whole page.

the languages of the Bible, masters of all the learning of the Fathers, or of the history of the Primitive Church, which they must be in some measure who sit judges of religious doctrines and opinions. . . . . Besides, the ascribing such a power to either of the two Houses or to both of 'em together, is to confirm the ground of the Papist's cavil at our Reformation, when they say that our religion is merely Parliamentary, and changeable at the will of the Prince and of the majority of the Peers and Commons, an assertion which I believe there is no worthy member of either House but would reject with disdain. . . . . They were wise enough to know that the preserving the Constitution is the best way to preserve their true and real interests, and that the Constitution can no otherwise be upheld than by the several parts of it being preserved in their just rights and powers, allowed to act in their proper spheres, and circumscribed within 'em. . . . . Convocation is an ecclesiastical Court or Assembly essential to our Constitution and established by the law of it, by the same law as the gentleman receives his rent, or the member enjoys his privilege. . . . . The same arguments used for stated and regular Parliaments exactly apply to Convocation. The king has no right to withhold his summons."

Of Atterbury's style the following extract may serve as a specimen. It occurs both in the Preface to the work before named and in the famous pamphlet called 'The Mitre and the Crown.' "Those Divines who read lessons to princes how to strain their ecclesiastical power to the utmost without exceeding it, and how to oppress their clergy legally, are surely not the best men of their order. They are Church Empsons and Dudleys, and

usually find the fate of such wretched instruments, to be detested by the one side and at last abandoned by the other."

What was the effect of this controversy? How has it left the rights of the Church on this point? Here is a summary by the best modern authority, the late Mr. Lathbury: "The licence to make canons ought, according to the opinion of all the men on both sides who took part in the controversy in the time of William III., Anne, and George I., to be granted whenever the Bishops and Clergy assembled in Convocation may represent to the Crown that it is required by the circumstances of the Church." How, then, could these admitted rights be overborne in practice? By a subterfuge. Convocation was summoned with every Parliament, and, after 1717, as regularly, immediately prorogued. But how could the nation, which had insisted on the revival, allow the disuse, of Convocation? No doubt the disputes which raged within that body were the principal cause. But it is equally certain that these disputes were more or less connected with the Jacobite struggles of the day. The Crown-appointed Whig Bishops were, to use the phrase then first adopted, Low Churchmen, and against them the Lower House, consisting chiefly of Tories and High Churchmen,* were perpetually at war, not always by any means upon frivolous grounds. The nation grew weary of these bickerings, the best excuse for which is to be found in the times themselves; and the statesmen dreaded them. Yet it must be maintained that never could a body of Churchmen point to their acts with more pride than Convocation to those which were the immediate cause of their suppression.

* On the difference between the past and present meanings of "High" and "Low" Church, see Lect. vii. p. 271.

It would indeed have been unworthy of the name of a Synod if it could have passed over attacks on fundamental principles so subversive of all ecclesiastical discipline as those of Hoadley. And count up the faults as we may of the "angry insects" over whom the "State was about to scatter a little dust," to use Mr. Hallam's elegant and courteous metaphor,* it has been remarked by a late and very moderate writer that their "censures of books, with the exception of Burnet's 'Exposition,' were always just."† Nor should we in common fairness forget that the obscurity which hung about the respective rights of the two Houses of Convocation was in great measure due to the long suspension of their exercise, and that the relative position of the two lay Houses of Parliament has itself been a matter for fierce contention throughout Parliamentary history. The active exercise of functions produces precedents, and precedents produce law. It is as unreasonable and ungenerous to make the struggles of this period an argument against the Church's privilege, as to sneer at the want of weight in the unreformed Convocation existing at this moment, and yet to resist all attempts to reform it.

That short period of seventeen years to which we have referred was the last opportunity the Church has had to place herself in her just and Constitutional position towards the Government, towards the members of her own body, and towards Dissenters. For a time the favour of Queen Anne and the affection of the people had made the Church a great political power. But the times were too disturbed; parties ran too

* Hallam's 'Constitutional History,' chap. xvi.

† Perry's 'History of the Church of England;' see also Joyce's 'England's Sacred Synods.'

high; too many of the Bishops of the previous reign had for a political reason been carefully selected for their opposition to a Church revival; and it was not surprising that the opposition to them on the part of more independent men should be both obstinate and acrimonious. It was impossible that any permanent settlement could be made, and the golden opportunity was lost.

It was no doubt wisely ordered that the period should have witnessed as much substantial recognition of the Church's independence as it did, and that such recognition should for a long time subsequently be denied. But if we are to account for the shocking decay of religion, the foul corruption of morals, the depravation of taste, the fatal ecclesiastical blunders, yes, and many of the grossest political mistakes of the succeeding century, we shall find it difficult to do so with candour unless we observe how the Georgian era produced a total suspension of the Church Parliament, a wholesale and deliberate abuse of the *Regale* in appointing Bishops, and a gradual deterioration of the Church's Courts. Yet, in regard of all these points, it must be noticed that the thread of continuity was never broken; and in consequence of the strength that still lay dormant in these unused rights, the orthodoxy of the Church, however decayed in individuals of the body, remained intact in the body itself. Her Formularies, in spite of numerous efforts, now taking the shape of attempts at a fatal amount of Comprehension, now of attempts to relax the terms of Subscription, have, as we know, remained unchanged.

It might be well worth while to inquire how much of the "darkness which might be felt" in the eighteenth century was due to re-action from the brilliant political struggles of the Revolution, and the bitter ecclesiastical

contests of Queen Anne's reign, as those were themselves re-actions from the treacherous State-craft and the glittering licentiousness of the preceding period; for there is no one portion of history which does not grow out of all the past: but the coincidence of the moral disgraces of the eighteenth century with the suppression of the Church's rights has struck all impartial observers, and cannot but have weight in such inquiries as the present. That century raises a warning voice. It proclaims that to keep an institution like the Church safely bottled up, as it were — a sort of possession to be placed on a shelf, protected from encroachment by State edicts, yet on condition of its submitting to be deprived of all that could exercise its life, or expand its energies,—is a suicidal policy, only worthy of Oriental decrepitude.* For the time must come when such a timid guardianship must cease perforce. Protection could not long avail. It did not long avail. No provision was made for the change that was sure to come. And when the seething tide of intellectual revolution set in, when men read, and questioned, and scoffed, and combined, when every barrier which the wisdom of ages had raised for the protection of religion and society seemed about to be swept away, it was no wonder that all but the most courageous despaired. We need not describe how the country was saved, under Providence, by the meritorious efforts of a truly good and sensible, if not clever monarch,† by the abilities and

* The Church of the last century is perhaps as much to blame as the State for the surrender of liberties which she might have claimed and even exercised.

† The fame of few monarchs has been more perseveringly "written down" than that of George III. The present generation is once more beginning to recover what was well enough known to the last but one.

magnanimity of certain great Statesmen, by the grand intellect of a few literary men, by the preaching of some ardent clergymen, by the agency of great religious Societies, through the fiery furnace of war, and the still more fiery conflict of opinion; till, at length, what may almost be called a new England once more emerged out of the ashes of the old, and a population nearly doubled in amount stood confronted with new problems of social life, new political combinations, new forms of Dissent, and — the same ancient, venerable Church.

It is enough to point out how the years 1828, 1829, and 1832, which witnessed the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Roman Catholic Emancipation, and the Reform Bill, all made necessary by the changes which the country had passed through, were the boundary between the times when the old relations of Church and State, however defective, were defensible, and the times when they became only tolerable under vigorous protest, and on condition of every member of the Church devoting himself to obtain their re-adjustment.

Henceforward we have a new political sense of the word "Church" taken in its connection with the State. We have seen it under an Incorporate Union, when the Church may almost be said to have meant the State regarded in its ecclesiastical aspect; and we have seen the sense of the word narrowed to mean the great Ecclesiastical Body, grouped round the working clergy. From the Reformation to the reign of William IV., we are conscious of a constant confusion between the two senses of the word, intensified by the growing discrepancy between the theory of the Church as co-ex-

tensive with the State, and the fact. But since that date this generation has been in contact with a different sense again. Church and State being no longer in theory co-extensive, the Church now only means that part of the people which remains within the old spiritual corporation, and with which the State, the whole body of Churchmen and non-Churchmen, in their political aspect, is in alliance.

The measures of the years above-mentioned did in reality completely upset the balance which had hitherto been preserved: and the perception of this fact is the best justification for the dogged obstinacy with which some of them were resisted. The question was not only, How is the Government to be carried on?—but,—How are Church and State to be kept together? Men might be excused for not perceiving the answer. With a Parliament no longer consisting of the Church's friends, and that Parliament coming more and more into the place of the Crown, how different, not only in the degree of interference implied, but in kind, was the old *Regale* under the new *régime!* How much weakened was the protection of the Sovereign's Coronation Oath, when the power of the Prime Minister was so largely increased, and when the House of Commons, which virtually created him, was so differently composed! The State had begun to relapse into the condition of heathen Empires; Church and State were no longer under any theory *one*.

It was well that the discovery of these startling results was not made too early or too suddenly. It might have produced a hasty disruption instead of a wise amendment. No after repentance could have availed against a false step once taken. But when,

in the opinion of many, the time seemed to have come for a fresh spoliation on the model of Henry VIII., then for the third time since the Revolution * arose the cry of the "Church in danger,"—the old cry, scoffed at by those who know and dread its power, but never, it may perhaps be said, raised without cause. As the voice of the people pronounced itself more and more clearly, as the clergy and increasing bodies of the laity sprang to their posts, as, in the minds of the better-educated, faith revived, as the intellect of the age began to bend itself to the problem now put before it, as the last hope that the *congé d'élire* was anything but a mockery collapsed at a touch, as the final depravation of the Court of Appeal became more apparent, so,—gradually, at first with faintness, then with ever-increasing sharpness, the outlines of the great Church Liberties which we have traced through so many ages, began to loom through the mist. Men began to see that while on the one hand the people were determined to keep their ancient Church, endeared to them by its old ties, and, now, by its new life, on the other hand that Church must be restored to a condition which the spirit of the Original Compact, almost destroyed, might once more penetrate.

This is the meaning of the demand which has been made in our own times for the REVIVAL OF CONVOCATION (of late happily effected †),—for a proper COURT

* In the reigns of Anne, George III. and William IV. (the last extending into the present reign).

† The demand for the *Reform* of Convocation rests on different grounds. If rights have been so long suppressed that when restored they require an adjustment which must have taken place had not their exercise been suspended, the strongest possible moral claim to

OF FINAL APPEAL,—for some voice in, or at least a veto on, the ELECTION OF BISHOPS, as well as for an increase of their number,—and for IMMUNITY FROM ALL HANDLING OF THE CHURCH'S DOCTRINE OR DISCIPLINE, EXCEPT WITH THE CONSENT OF HER OWN ASSEMBLIES. It was one thing, said the modern reformers, to bear a suspension of rights from the Government of a State nominally one with, and theoretically friendly to, the Church, as, for instance, even in pre-Reformation times, the Church had to bear it during the reign of William Rufus; it was another to be placed for the most part in the condition of the sects, and not to be allowed the privileges those sects enjoyed; privileges secured by charter, and only suspended by political accidents long since vanished; privileges no longer in the remotest degree dangerous to the State; privileges not only vital for the Church, but for the sects themselves; privileges absolutely required for the practical development of the Church amidst the millions whom she has not reached at home and abroad. Without entering on political discussions it is scarcely too much to say, that the men who have used such language have spoken the language of history as well as common sense.

For have we not seen how these privileges are inherent rights, how they have been so in all ages and in all branches of the Church, and how, where most overlaid abroad, a substitute is practically found in other ways? With us it has been shewn there are no other ways. On the one hand, there are great masses of the population which the Church has not reached; on the other, she cannot, till Rome throws off her corruptions,

adjustment must be admitted, but this is not absolutely the same thing as a direct and legal claim.

derive support from Western Christendom. This age, more than any other, has been thrown back on its own English resources. Present responsibilities can only be read in the history of the past, and we have asked the past. The jewel of Primitive Doctrine along with a True Priesthood is yet preserved in the Church of England, or it would cease to be a true Church. What reason have Englishmen, grounded either on history or analogy, for believing that the jewel can be retained unless the decayed and tottering sides of the casket are kept in repair?

Happily, in a self-governed country like England, with institutions evolved out of the struggles of many ages, and yet never broken by revolutions, there is always a self-adjusting process going on, which in the course of time reconciles the most jarring claims. Reason and Time in such a nation have a tendency to form, however slowly, a correct public opinion. Let the most powerful classes of the land, those middle classes amongst which the Church has in this generation taken so much deeper root than in the last, once clearly perceive the nature of the inheritance into which they have come, let them once entertain the notion that spiritual independence on the part of the Church (an independence which does not exclude—far from it, which demands the constant and vigorous action of the Church Laity in her affairs) is an absolute necessity, if it is to be a Church at all;* let them once understand the difference between the influence of State-government on such a body when that Government is wielded by a *Rex pius*, a Constantine, a

* "The Church herself must be in her sphere as intact and as free as the State in hers."—Guizot (quoted in Fuller's 'Court of Final Appeal.')

Charlemagne, a Saint Louis, or even an Elizabeth, and when wielded by a body of rulers many of whom are not by profession Churchmen, and they will see that, if things are not to come to a dead lock, forbearance is necessary in the use of their undeniably great power. On the part of the Church as well as of the State, there must be the greatest moderation in pushing claims, a spirit of conciliation rather than a reckless rushing to extremities.

No one can imagine that civil liberty ought to cease to be as jealously guarded as ever, but common sense is daily shewing that much of the jealousy of ecclesiastical agency on this score is a mere bugbear, too often dishonestly flaunted by designing men. If we may venture to look a little into the future we may prophesy that the management of Church affairs will very soon be left more and more to Churchmen, and instead of enfeebling, from a vague fear of some latent injury to the State, every effort on their part to attain a condition of healthy action, that the love of freedom and openness and discussion, which has led to such great results in English politics, will, as time goes on, extend itself to the feelings of Englishmen generally in reference to the Church; while in the Church's own free, independent action, and free debate, will be found the true antidote to those poisonous errors over which men have mourned in past history and which they dread in the future. In short, the increased freedom of the State must necessarily bring with it increased freedom to the Church; and within that body itself the difficulties which beset the reconciliation of authority and liberty will be overcome through the organized co-operation of the different ranks of the clergy and Church-laity, through

the increased efficiency of Church institutions too long disused.

For the Church herself no one need fear when she is once aroused. As Parliament and people did not make her, so, as Archbishop Trench in his Primary Charge has nobly said, Parliament and people cannot mar her.* The danger of the day, the danger which every educated man should set himself to combat, is for the State. If it does not solve the problem of its time, a problem no more difficult than those of many another time, it may cut itself off from what at present forms its chief strength, its main title to respect. It is not easy to see how the connection of Church and State, if it is once broken, can ever be repaired.

* And yet, true as this is, the danger of so-called Erastianism is not a dream. It was said by perhaps the acutest of the champions of the faith at a dark period of our history, that "the Erastian principle has had two visible effects in England; it has turned the gentry Deists, and the common people Dissenters; for the Dissenters, one and all, from Presbyterians down to Muggletonians, pretend to Divine Commission independent of all the powers upon the earth; therefore the people run to them and look upon the Church of England as a Parliamentary religion and establishment of the State; and the Deists, when they find themselves in committees of religion, can never think that there is anything Divine in that which they see stand or fall by their vote."—Leslie's 'Case of the Regale,' p. 611.

For an unanswerable defence of the liberties of the Church see the speeches of Bishops Blomfield and Wilberforce, and the Earl of Derby, then Lord Stanley, in the debate in the House of Lords in 1850. (This has been lately made more accessible by being quoted almost *in extenso* in Fuller's 'Court of Final Appeal.')

LECTURE V.

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE IMPERIAL AND NATIONAL PRINCIPLES, OR, THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE PAPACY.

NOVEMBER 10, 1866.

ITALIAN Nationality! The loss of the Pope's Temporal Power! How strange, how dream-like would these words have sounded a very few years ago! Yet how familiar are we already beginning to be with the ideas they convey! How, in a University where Mediæval History has become a study, can such ideas fail to connect themselves with the long past? Putting aside the ordinary controversial points of view, without for a moment denying their importance, let us glance at the history which these words call up. If we are witnesses to the climax of many centuries, if this is the first time for a thousand years that the conjunction of these two phenomena has been—we will not say accomplished, but imminent—we may well ask ourselves what has hindered the conjunction up to this time; and the consideration of this question may afford us some dim light as to the future. If we can trace the gradual unfolding of a scheme, one marked epoch of which is even now drawing on itself the attention of the world, it must naturally occur to us that this scheme is likely to have a still further development.

That the history of the world has been the history of an education no one will deny; and what does that mean but an education for an end? The universal

voice of mankind puts in a claim for Progress. It may be intellectual, religious, material, political; but in one form or other we all admit a Progress. Even when we trace recurrences and parallels in history we cannot help perceiving that they are like the periodical return of the spoke of a wheel to the ground. There is a certain uniformity in the details of the movement, but it is still forward. Further, the line of this progress is evolved along the course of man's experimental training; he is permitted to work out the problem for himself. The solution of it is a process of growth and development, not indeed in the sphere of the Christian Faith, which was given once for all, but in all those relations of social and political life with which that Faith is mixed up, and this process seems to be connected with a perpetual conflict of principles, an ever-present clashing of two opposite ideas. We may observe the conflict in Philosophy, in Politics, in the religious training of mankind. It is part of a great law of our Nature, meeting us at every turn. These principles are represented in a variety of forms by what in philosophical analysis is known as the One and the Many. The history of Politics, the history of the Church, is nothing else but a history of this eternal struggle. How to reconcile Law and Liberty, System and the claims of the Individual, Centralization and Local Government, Dependence and Independence, the Imperial and the Regal, the Œcumenical and the National, is the problem of every age,—as old as the infancy of the human race, as young as the society of to-day, confined to no clime, to be comprised in no formula equally available at different times. Men may not perceive how they are working it out; they may mistake the relative

position of their age; but as time unrolls the whole, the progress made in solving the problem becomes visible..

It is visible, however, as yet only in the heirs of the civilization which travelled from the original Asiatic centre, in the heirs of the Christianity for which all previous Dispensations had existed. Not all men at once were to receive this education. Some seem to be waiting till the great lesson has been learnt by the favoured branches of the one family. Take Africa as the contrast, and at the same time the illustration, of this view. There no settled government from generation to generation trains the character of her children from father to son, from son to grandson. No Revelation has prepared the way for a further and a further light. And thus no ideas are perpetuated and improved; no political traditions carry conviction with the training of infancy; no great natural gifts—and it is false to deny their existence in Africa—germinate and reproduce themselves, but on the contrary they die out with their possessor; no gradual enlargement of the faculties till they obtain a full and complete development takes place, but Africans remain for ever children. And men of our day, forgetful of their own progenitors, ignoring the vast history of their own branch of the great family, shutting their eyes to the commonest effects of education, are tempted to deny that "God hath made of one blood all the nations upon Earth."

And are we not witnesses of the very process of transfer from the more favoured to the less? Is it not a fact, that just as all Europe to her remotest corners has received this inheritance, just when law, order, and to some extent self-government, have prevailed over European barbarism, just when the Celtic, the Teutonic, and the

Sclavonic races have become thoroughly penetrated with Greek and Roman influences, and distinctively marked with the prevailing hue of their own religion and politics—just when this consummation is taking place, the word has gone forth, and the faint efforts which have been of late years spasmodically made to extend Europe to Africa, Eastern Asia, and the Isles, is growing before our eyes into a united movement which gives token of the Future that is to be. Is it not a fact that America, Russia, and the European Colonies are just at this period commencing a glorious rivalry with Europe in the effort? Do we not see that the processes by which heathen Greece and Rome extended themselves over the adjacent parts of Europe and Asia, and by which Christian Greece and Rome spread their influences over a larger area, are now being repeated on the grandest scale over the whole world?

What is the central idea underlying the main agencies in this progressive conquest? What is the central idea of Law and Order? What of Christianity? We shall all agree that it is Unity. The material upon which Christianity and Law and Order are brought to bear represents the principle of Diversity, Individualism, Plurality. As in man's own individual nature, so in societies of men, however small, however large, there is the same constant effort to throw off and burst asunder the bonds which the principle of Unity is for ever weaving around them. There must always be some method of reconciling these principles more suited than another for each particular age and condition of society. If the method in vogue is not suitable, it has to give way to one that is. The progress is not stopped. It is no wonder then that men should find it

difficult to discern in each age how this reconciliation is to be effected, and that they should be sorely tempted to give more weight than is due to one or other of the principles. It would be strange if they did not constantly exhibit a reluctance to give up a particular form of reconciliation which had once appeared practically all-important, and which had perhaps come down to them as absolutely essential to all notion of growth and progress.

We are about to trace the conflict of principles working out their great end in our own Continent, but we must not forget that the history of Europe is but a part of the great drama of the Past, as it is but a step in the progress towards the Future. No one of the pre-Roman Empires existed for itself alone. Each exhibited a progress. Each passed on something to its successor. It is a common-place of history, but it is necessary for our purpose to remark that the last, the Roman, gathering up all that had preceded it, gathering up all lessons of Eastern and Greek civilization on the one hand, all the pregnant power destined to be exercised by Christianity on the other, launched both on their glorious path by an impulse the world had never before seen, a refined political system of Imperial Administration, the result of long centuries of gradual growth.

So great was the impulse thus given, so lasting its effect, so completely had the theory of Imperialism been grafted into the European mind as the normal state of things, that though the Empire was shattered to pieces, though a modern Europe was formed by the settlement of the hosts which received the inheritance of power, there was always, for many ages afterwards, a

tendency, manifested by violent recurring efforts, to revive the Imperial idea. The European history of the last fourteen hundred years has been nothing more nor less than a history of attempts to restore a visible religious and political Unity, a history of Individualism and then of Nationality surging up against these attempts, a history of assumptions of old Roman power by those who had no right to it, assumptions resting on a rehabilitation of what were once facts, but which had really passed away, or built upon theories made for the occasion, built often on the most shameless frauds. The conflict of these principles went hand-in-hand in the sphere of Ecclesiastical Organization and that of Politics, the two spheres being often apparently, but perhaps never really separated. There has been one grand perpetual struggle to restore once more what will never be again, Visible Universal Empire. Perhaps,—for we must not dogmatize, possibly, we are now arrived at the time when we may see not only that these efforts must fail, but that it is best they should fail; when it will be plain to all alike, that the ends which Imperialism and Visible Unity in Christendom were first intended to fulfil have long since been attained, and that the further progress of Christianity and civilization will be best secured by a Union of a different kind, more adapted to the age at which mankind has arrived.

The Fourth Empire, which, though shattered to pieces, was not to be wholly destroyed until the end, has shewn in its broken condition the marvellous vitality which was predestined. The visions of Empire, vain and delusive as they have been, have tenaciously clung in some form or other to the original centre. Rome has been for ever the plaything of Popes and Princes,

Italy the principal arena of the furious struggle for so many ages of the two grand conflicting principles. How often has her unhappy fate excited the imagination of the poet and the philosopher! How dearly has she paid for her once proud superiority! How ill has her mission to humanize the rude masses across her frontier been repaid! We have almost become tired of the mournful tale. Yet if it carries aloft a light let us not refuse to follow it once more. Let us very briefly trace the progress of the undying struggle, as we are now, after those violent oscillations which have not even yet perhaps subsided into perfect equilibrium, able to read it. We often lose our sense of the whole by dwelling on particular parts. Let us weave it into one short narrative.

There are three distinct periods in which the contest of the two principles just mentioned must be indicated.

I. The Period which lay between the extinction of the old Roman Empire and the formation under Charlemagne of that Western Mediæval Empire which usurped its name, 476—800.

II. The Period of Mediæval Empire under its three phases (1) Frank, 800—840* (2) Germano-Italian, 964—1250, and (3) German, 1250—1494.

III. The Modern Period.

The Church has its own distinct phases falling exactly parallel with these divisions. Let us now speak of the first Period.

I. The Fifth Century witnessed the real break-up of what had been known through all previous ages as Imperial power. Imperial influences survived the wreck, and affected all subsequent institutions; Ecclesiastical

* "The Carlovingian Empire expired with Louis the Pious." —Milman's 'Latin Christianity,' Book v. ch. 3.

influences aided in the transformation of society. But the invasion and settlement of the Teutonic barbarians gave the final blow to permanent Imperial government in Western Europe. The attempts to resuscitate it in later times on some different system, by which the ancient Empire might be imitated, have been transient. They have been failures as to the object which they proposed to attain; they could not last; but they have not been without their use to the world. Far from it. They have been parts of the great scheme. Each revival of Imperialism had its work to do.

Instead, then, of this old and sacred principle by which hitherto law and order had prevailed over anarchy, and along with which, though from no one visible Western centre, Christianity had made its way, now, in the Fifth Century, reared its head the principle of Individualism, Independence, Local Government; at first bringing back the West to the anarchy out of which Imperial Rome had raised it, soon emerging into a system which, the joint and healthy progeny of Rome and Teutonism, got to be called the Feudal System, and finally, when the mockery of Imperialism had passed away, became Nationality. Numbers, military energy, intellectual life, elasticity which raised it up again after each evanescent triumph of Imperialism, the moral weight of ever-recurring success, lay with this principle. It was destined to prevail.

During the period of which we are now speaking, some have seen, in the pompous claim of the feeble Emperors of the East to be recognized in the seat vacated by the Emperors of the West, and in the titles they amused themselves by conferring on the barbaric conquerors of Roman provinces, a true mark of Im-

perialism. The writers who seem to take the most philosophical view of this period refuse to attach importance to such empty boasts. They see, and surely with justice, simply an independent, practical government by the Teutonic sword, a mere convenient stroke of cunning in the occasional acceptance of Roman titles, playing upon that fondness with which men will desperately cling to a theory long after it has become a dream.

One, and one only partial and brief triumph of Imperialism took place, and of that Italy was the principal scene. A man of genius, a perverted genius, at least in politics, arose to arrest for a moment the decadence of the Eastern Empire. He knew not the part he was performing in the drama. Italy, like the rest of the Roman provinces, had been conquered and settled by Teutons; and a career like that of her neighbours seemed about to open when Justinian turned his arms against the West. His great generals gave him the government of Italy for fourteen years, and then a new people, the Lombards, crossing the Alps, once more restored Teutonic supremacy. But what had this brief domination carried with it? It was not the only cause, but it had no slight effect on the subsequent separation of the East and West; it destroyed at the critical moment the military strength of Italy and Africa. On what might have been the case had the genius of a Justinian, a Belisarius, and a Narses, been employed in reducing those barbarians on the Eastern frontier who afterwards enfeebled the Byzantine Empire for so many ages, it is vain to speculate, but the actual result of the policy pursued was the triumph of Mahometanism, the schism of the Church, a sickly East, an ever hostile West, the mediæval fabric of Rome.

The feeble Exarchate of Ravenna, Justinian's legacy, was but the ghost of departing Imperialism, the last shadow of the old form, useful as securing a few centres of civilization which the new invaders, the Lombards, (who could scarcely have entered Italy had the Goths repulsed the Imperialists) might have destroyed. But the Exarchate was doing its appointed work. It kept alive that sense of the unnatural insult which the West had suffered by being conquered from the East, a feeling which never, after that moment of conquest, faded away. Rome had been the mistress of the world, and had ill brooked a rival in her daughter. That daughter was now a cruel mistress, and yet impotent to afford protection. That Lombards and Saracens might plunder unhappy Italy in spite of her was not calculated to produce respect. The Iconoclastic struggle which ejected the Byzantines was but the accidental termination of an entire anachronism, the inevitable conclusion of that which was concluding itself. The schism was to be. Rome was to rule the West. Mahometanism was to obtain a footing. The education of the world required that a fresh shoot of the old fruit-bearing Imperialism should be grafted into the vigorous trunk of mediæval Europe.

Just as in the social and political condition of the West the two principles were thus shifting and confused, the influences of Roman Law and Imperial institutions moulding and modifying Teutonic Individualism, so was it with the Church. If the principle of Unity was to be found anywhere it was here. Though its early simplicity was lost, there was still to be found some echo of the Unity of Primitive times. The gradual and steady growth of the claims made by Rome to Supremacy has been traced by the hand of

a master, the late lamented Professor Hussey.* He has shown how the precedence, the Primacy which the Popes of primitive times had alone claimed, was, by a series of frauds and impostures and by the constant reassertion of such frauds and impostures till their character was forgotten, changed into a claim to Supremacy during this very period. It can indeed scarcely be denied that she took advantage of her position at every turn of affairs, that she made each of her just claims to respect and affection, claims as the Mother of Churches amongst the barbarous invaders of the Empire, the foe to heresy, the centre of ecclesiastical order in the midst of political anarchy, the preserver and ally of Roman civilization,—stepping stones to another position, wholly opposed to that of earlier times. But it is also true, as we all know, that her greatest and best Pope, St. Gregory, in his letters to the Byzantine Patriarch, utterly repudiated such a claim; that, though adopted soon after his time, it was resisted in various countries; and that, harassed by Lombards and Greeks, Rome was ill able to sustain it. Though the long series of spiritual assumptions by which she was creeping up into the Mediæval Papacy had indeed been accumulating, and though the wealth of the Church was already great, no solid and permanent territorial power as yet tempted her to the lordly acts of later times.

But towards the end of this period many causes were at work which placed these pretensions on a wholly different footing. Monasticism, which was of undoubted service as long as monks were laymen, was already weakening the National Churches and proportionately adding to the strength of Rome; the Mahometan con-

* 'Rise of the Papal Supremacy' (Parkers).

quests were more and more shutting out the Eastern Church from the horizon of the West; the African and Spanish Churches at the very door of Rome lay prostrate under the followers of the False Prophet. Rome was becoming more and more a visible centre for what was left. By the time the period closes we find her winged for a fresh flight. Already the voice of a Pope has pronounced the fall of an effete dynasty. The withdrawal of Byzantine pressure has encouraged the growth of long-cherished ambitious designs. The National Churches are beginning to lose their freedom. The principle of a central ecclesiastical standard of reference, co-existing with local ecclesiastical self-government, and hitherto harmonized with it to some extent, is beginning to merge in a gigantic attempt at Ecclesiastical Absolutism.

During these centuries the Nations of modern Europe assumed the rude outline of their present shape. Most of Gaul has become West France. The Rhenish Provinces are commencing a national life. Britain is now the land of the Anglo-Saxons. Spain, in the hands of the Mahometans, is fringed with a band of independent Teutons commencing that long education of religious warfare which was to stamp its mark for ever on a nation separate and distinct from all others. Perhaps hers was a happier fate than that of Italy, which, torn and bleeding from the struggles of others than Italians, waited for the still further development of the great world-conflict upon her soil. North and Central Germany, Scandinavian and North-Eastern Europe, had not yet awoke from their barbaric sleep. With the change of masters had come a change of language. Latin had ceased to be spoken in the old Roman pro-

vinces. A corrupt *lingua rustica*, varying in each, had taken its place. The old Literature had disappeared. A vast growth of Legendary lore had superseded it. A whole new system of Ecclesiastical life had sprung into being. Fresh channels of trade and commerce had been opened. Barbarous dynasties had succeeded one another. The means of communication between town and town, society and society, had been broken up or materially diminished. Isolation had succeeded to the place of fellow-citizenship. A new and hostile religion had spread round the Mediterranean. What a gulf separated the men of the eighth from the men of the fifth century! Let us measure it by comparing the Europe of three or four centuries ago with that of to-day; and no change anything like so great has taken place. However plainly we perceive the fragments of Imperialism still strewed about, we must surely associate the approaching development rather with the ideas of novelty, imitation, adaptation, skilful statecraft, subtle contrivance, than with that of continuance from something which had never stopped.

II. (1) In the ears of such a Europe,—we have arrived at our Second Period,—was sounded in loudest notes the old watchword of Imperialism; the old watchword, and yet not the same, for it was linked with a new one—Papal Supremacy, a Supremacy wielded in concert with Imperial power, and resting on a territorial basis of its own. Church and State are to be visibly united, not Nationally but Imperially. We might be inclined to ask—Why was not Europe allowed to work out her Nationality in Church and State unhindered by this recurrence of Imperialism which, marching along with a Papacy soon to lose its title to respect, brought with

it so much evil along with the good? As well might we ask why evil is permitted at all. At least the same answer must be given. It seems to have been part of the world's probation, its moral education. We may see even more. Europe was not ripe for a full and unchecked development of Nationality. She certainly did not feel herself so. The principle of Visible Unity had yet a work to do both in the sphere of politics and religion. The old and the new, the civilized and the barbarous, were not sufficiently welded together. To use the old illustration, the schoolmistress was still wanted for the infantine and yet vigorous mind of mediæval Europe. The orders of society were not yet coherent in Constitutions. The Feudal System was but a rude and severe, though a true and faithful preparation for civilization. It was already at work, and it evidently required more than the gentle voice of the Church to tame and soften it. That Church must be armed with power; its guardians must speak with authority, and they must look for assistance beyond their own boundaries.

A combination of causes brought about this wonderful phenomenon of Mediæval Imperialism in Church and State. It was not only that the liberated Papacy, having now raised its head to Supremacy, had begun to look about for the strongest secular arm on which it could rely; nor only that the Eastern Franks, having been trained to greatness by their position as the bulwark between half-civilized France and barbarous non-Frankish Germany, and being the acknowledged heirs of their already decrepit Western brethren, held the foremost place in Europe as the champions of order and religion. The Church and the State were ready, but

what was that without the instrument, without the man who could combine the two in a splendid but unreal and unstable union, a union which was, however, in its effects, to colour the future of the world? At this juncture he also appeared. Such men are only produced at rare intervals; since the Christian era Constantine and Justinian alone can be compared with Charlemagne in the influence they have exercised on the world's history. European society was also well prepared for the new state of things. We shall best understand how the revival of the old idea could have taken such a sudden hold on the mediæval mind, if we think for a moment what it was, in that age of fearful struggle and invasion and unsettlement, to have a standard of order and religious unity set up by a powerful hand. It was this instinct which, from the very extinction of the Roman Empire, had led Europe to rally round each chief who proved himself the centre of resistance to the ever-surging tide of barbarism, behind each strong barrier which could preserve what still lingered on of the Civilization and the Christianity of Roman times. Such a man at the head of his tribe or his nation was, whether called Emperor or not, the leading figure of the age, and to him all eyes were turned.

Thus Clovis, when he drove back the Alemanni from the gates of Gaul, earned his place as the earliest founder of a modern Nation, the leader in the race of modern civilization. To France, in memory of that struggle, has Germany been ever since Allemagne. Thus Charles Martel, by his victory over the Saracens, established the pre-eminence of the Austrasian Franks as the leading people of Western Europe. Thus, in a far higher degree, by his marvellous campaigns against

every enemy of order and Christianity in succession, was Charles the Great recognized as Emperor by the voice of Europe. Thus, when Charles's work had long ago fallen to pieces, the Saxon dynasty, as the only power which could save Europe from the Hungarian scourge, was permitted to make one more feeble imitation of Imperialism. Thus, even in their expiring agonies, the Hohenstaufen made a last appeal to Europe by stemming the tide once and for ever of Mongol invasion. What men sighed for was rest and peace. The plaintive cry is forced from the heart of every chronicler whose work has come down to us. To procure rest and peace the old titles were once and again revived, only to lose their significance the moment after the necessity had passed away. A convenient idea was seized without too close an inspection of its meaning. Each century meanwhile was nursing into sufficient strength to stand by itself the principle of *Nationality*.

Parallel with this revival of Secular Imperialism ran, as we have said, the movement of the Western Church. The two can never be separated in mediæval history. Though on a more spacious foundation, the Ecclesiastical fabric was still more based than its ally on an unreality, still more occupied a false position, still more was tainted by the parentage of craft and fraud. A supply always follows a demand. Men demanded vigour and visible unity. The Carlovingian Chiefs and the Papacy met the demand. The alliance equally suited both parties. The Popes desired an advocate. A lay advocate for the local Churches had become an institution; the Popes must have theirs. The strongest must be their champion. A Pepin must be crowned to cement the alliance, and a Pope must receive territorial power at

his hands. A Charles must be raised to Empire in order to consummate the exchange of gifts. "Henceforth," says Milman, "the Pope, if not a temporal Sovereign, is a temporal Potentate." On the side of the Church the modest claim of earlier days issues in the hoarse tones of a Supremacy to be wielded by force, and that force was now at his disposal. If the title is not good enough, another shall be invented, no matter how. On the side of the ally, the Teutonic might, which had repelled the foes of Christendom, finds its advantage in clothing itself with the ancient majesty of bygone centuries, under the sanction of an Ecclesiastical power of which, in this capacity, those centuries knew nothing. It was but a parody of the old idea. A centre of dynastic Imperialism was now formed in the far North with which Rome had nothing to do but to give a name.

From this period a new order of things arises which is so complex, so shifting, that it will appear in a different light almost from whatever point of view we regard it. Each nation has its own view of the Mediæval Empire. There is a German,* an Italian, a French standpoint. There is a purely secular, a purely Ecclesiastical aspect. Schools of writers spring up round each. Most persons will, however, agree that one result at least of Charlemagne's extraordinary career may be well expressed thus. What he accomplished for the protection of North Roman civilization, what he did for the Franks, remained. What he attempted of Imperialism

* The German view, introduced into English literature chiefly through Sir F. Palgrave, has been lately well put out by Mr. Bryce in his 'Holy Roman Empire.' It supposes a continuity of the Empire very different from that taken by most of our standard authors, as well as in this Lecture.

broke to pieces after his death. None but he who had drawn the bond round the discordant elements of barbarism might retain it in its place. It must also be said for recalcitrant society that Unity had been effected at the cost of so much freedom as well as licence, that in no hand but his were men willing to lodge their treasure. But though his Empire broke to pieces like the worn-out system which it had imitated, his work was not destroyed. We know how the various parts of this vast fabric retained his mark, how the broken fragments of the mirror still gave back the image he had impressed, the image coloured and harmonized with all the German, all the Roman, all the Ecclesiastical hues of the period; how, in short, the feudal Sovereignties which emerged from the chaos were higher types of civilization than before, and only wanting time to form into Nationalities. The fusion of the two principles, short as it had been, had done its work once more, and another stage had been reached.

In no one of these fragments of the Empire is it easier to trace the effects of the great mediæval alliance than in Italy. If she gained along with others some coherence of society, some links of order; if her Capital once more professed to bestow crowns; if she indulged in the fond imagination that, without the right of conquest, she was to rule as of yore, she assuredly received one fatal inheritance. The Goth and the Lombard had, indeed, conquered Italy, but they had settled there; their blood had mingled with that of the natives, and their language had lent its part in the formation of the new tongue. Now, however, from this time, a precedent had been formed,—nay, a right had been given, for interference in Italy by a Northern people who made no

pretence of dwelling within her borders. She, or rather the Popes in her name, had bartered for immediate deliverance, for a loftier position in Europe, the independence of a thousand years to come!

Charlemagne has been claimed exclusively both by French and Germans, claimed exclusively with an assurance and a bitterness which would be surprising if we did not know how tempting it is to push our own ideas under the sanction of a great name. He belonged to both. The name of the people of whom he was chief has settled down upon the left of the Rhine, and thus the French are apt to forget that his own branch of that people dwelt principally on the banks of the river, and extended far to the right of it. The Germans, relying on the latter fact, forget that the Gallo-Roman population of Neustrian France, impregnated during more than three centuries by the Frank conquest, was the comparatively civilized centre and basis of the great monarch's dominions. Subsequent history is marked in every page by this dualism. Of the three vertical sections into which the Empire of Charles was divided, the centre from the Adriatic to the Ocean was the bone, the long narrow back-bone over which the people on either side immediately began to contend, and over which they have contended down to our own day. What is the perpetual demand of France for the left bank of the Rhine but the quarrel for Lothaire's strip of territory? What the constant readiness to snap at Belgium, what the long and bitter contest for Italy, what the frequent violations of Swiss independence, but the reproduction of mediæval history? Of those Carlovingian chiefs indeed who, after Louis le Débonnaire, sported with the name of Emperor, chiefs often as feeble as any in their so-called dominions, one only was a

Sovereign of France; while it was in the German portion of the Frank Empire that were found, at a later date, the vigorous Saxon, Franconian, and Suabian chiefs, whose claim to be the protectors of civilization was acknowledged by Christendom. The Othos, the Henrys, and the Fredericks, were strong while the feudal sovereigns of France were weak, and thus for the greater part of three centuries we have a German predominance of force accepted by Europe as the only alternative. But no sooner had the French Sovereignty begun in its turn to triumph over the elements of disorder, than the latent claims to interference in Italy which the French deduced from Charlemagne began to be exercised. And so the assumption of Papal power over France, which had grown out of the Imperial position of the Popes during the ages of French weakness, power often exerted with wisdom, but much oftener unworthily and selfishly, began to be resisted with greater and greater unanimity. It was resisted with the more resolution in proportion as the Papal pretensions became more preposterous. When the Empire and the Papacy were united in policy, that circumstance alone afforded ground for opposition; when engaged in their numerous bitter struggles with one another, the Papacy was ignored or insulted. Thus a strong Gallican feeling arose once more, a feeling which had already been strong in the Carlovingian period, the "age of the Bishops," but which, while the gigantic fabric was being reared under a Hildebrand, an Alexander, and an Innocent, was for a time in abeyance. When the Papacy and the Empire alike had passed their zenith, this sentiment became not only general, but visible in its effects on the most pious of French princes. It is notorious that no sovereigns asserted the liberties of the French National Church

more effectively than Blanche and St. Louis. A much further step was taken when the long and bitter strife between Guelf and Ghibeline brought the Pope on his knees, and introduced Charles of Anjou (1266). Henceforth French politics are never separated from Italy. With the fierce and cruel Charles come fresh masters. Italy is the centre round which French, German, and Spanish contests rage, and have raged, down to our own day.

That, during this Imperial phase of the world's history, this double Empire of Pope and Teutonic King in fitful starts of grandeur and mockery, broken by many an interregnum, a great work was done for the good of Europe along with and in spite of much evil, can scarcely be disputed. We are ourselves a part of what was done. It is not for us to speculate how the result might have been brought about by purer means.

No doubt it was an unnatural Priest-Kingdom in its very essence which was thus built up. No doubt the very notion of ecclesiastics bearing the sword and governing a people as secular sovereigns is repugnant to that sense of fitness, that common sense to which all such matters are in the end referable. Nothing but a specious show of reasoning against which multitudes revolted then, and still greater multitudes now, nothing but the flagrant abuse of applying to the Papacy wholly irrelevant precedents drawn from the Jewish polity, nothing but that strange confusion of ideas which attends a transition stage of society, could have permitted such a theory to shape itself into an accomplished fact. This Priest-Kingdom, beginning in a crafty and worldly policy, raised into a high-handed Supremacy by the very worst of all possible means, the astounding Forgery of

the Decretals, could not but take up more of the earthly dross with every accretion of temporal power; and in exact proportion it could not but lose its title to spiritual respect. Leaning upon a staff which at first appeared able to give support, it soon found that its side was pierced. Assuming to be, by the very nature of the case, the superior in virtue and lofty motive, it had the humiliation of being again and again put to shame by the superior qualities of its secular ally. Scarcely ever in accord with the Emperors it had set up, its history is one long dreadful record of wars and intrigues. Its highest title to respect, its zeal for the transmission of the Faith, was ruined by the frequent and open display of the worst motives; the noblest Popes were ill able to stem the tide of deterioration. Corruptions of the Faith only made their progress too easily under such a system. The way was only too surely prepared for the further schism of the West, while it was not without significance that, exactly in proportion as this Priest-Kingdom advanced, the schism of the East and West gained more and more of its envenomed and irremediable character.

And yet, hollow as it was—as hollow as the unreal Empire of the West so often reconstructed, so often falling to pieces,—fearful as was their joint participation in the violence of forced conversions, the torture and murder of heretics, the crimes of all kinds committed in the name of religion, we yet see, and we cannot shut our eyes to it, a progress on the whole towards good. At the end of the time nearly all Europe had at any rate received Christianity; National political life, with the germs of National Churches, had been planted from North to South, from East to West (the Eastern Church

doing also its work of a similar kind in more or less honourable rivalry); a common language and a common law, which existed almost entirely through the Church, formed a bond of union in the midst of variety, and left Europe, in spite of the break-up of Imperialism, in many respects a brotherhood of nations; the rights of the people, championed by the Church, made themselves felt in every State; humanizing truces were forced by the Church on sanguinary warriors; the arbitration of Popes sometimes effected a peace; the civilization in which Italy rose superior to all crossed the Alps; the literature of Italy in two great streams of the eleventh and the fourteenth centuries fertilized the ruder soils beyond.

How did Italy look upon these reconstructions of the shattered Empire of the mighty Frank? During the decadence of his House it has become a congeries of feudal Sovereignties, with a Pope, himself a feudal chief, only far more contemptible than the worst and weakest, with an Emperor whose name was a sport and a shadow in the midst of conflicting petty potentates. At length the very name departs as it came. Kings of Italy take the place of Emperors, and the Italians, or at least that portion of them over which the Empire of the West had extended, begin to look on Italy once more as their own. Soon walled cities grow up under the necessity of repelling Hungarian invasion, and under their shelter grew the spirit of self-defence, independence, Nationality.

(2) But the hour has come again. The elements of power in Italy are still unbalanced. Its bitter intestine divisions, and, still more, the horrible state of the Papacy, again tempt interference from without. The Saxon dynasty has arisen in its might. Europe owes that dynasty its salvation from the terrible Hungarians,

and tacitly rewards it by the fatal gift of Charles's crown; a gift fatal alike to Germany and Italy if measured by its effects in mediæval times, though serving a momentary purpose, and part, as we must admit, of the great plan by which good was to be evolved at last. The second phase of Mediæval Imperialism, the Germano-Italian, has commenced. For half a century, with many a struggle, with but the briefest temporary accord, the Trans-alpine people holds its supremacy. What took place at this period was but the type of the future connection, a connection made by force, defended on a specious theory, retained only by frequent invasions of German armies, full of the most obvious evils far outweighing any immediate advantages. The necessity under which the Emperors of this Holy Roman Empire continually lay to cross the Alps and keep up their connection with Italy, was for them in its very nature a ruinous source of trouble and distress. Though not so fully developed in the Saxon dynasty as afterwards, it was plain even then that it was the fatal blot in the theory. An elective head of a feudal society could not possibly leave his unquiet realm and cross such a vast barrier as the Alps without disastrous consequences. No sooner was his back turned on one part of his dominions than conspiracy and rebellion broke out in another; no sooner were these quelled than the Germany or the Italy he had just left broke out again. But this was only a part of the difficulty. The position of the Pope both as a temporal and spiritual Sovereign gave him a hold on Germany and Italy often far more powerful than that of the Emperor himself. If one arm failed, the other was brought into play. The Norman settlers, the Italian cities, the discontented feudal chiefs of Germany,

were mere puppets in his hands. No minorities enfeebled the Papal Government. A succession of astute and often conscientious as well as able men, who believed they were doing God the highest service, gradually changed the notion of a Governor of Christendom coordinate with the Emperor, into one of Supremacy, not only over all other Potentates, but over the Emperor himself. All crowns alike were held to be feudally subject to God's Vicegerent. Thus the Emperors presented the pitiable spectacle of some powerful animal baited—sometimes baited to death, by inferior beasts, who are set on, combined, and whipped into the conflict by the consummate skill of the higher intelligence, man. Yet, in spite of all, it is equally true that the name of Emperor was of service in the reclamation of the still uncivilized parts of Germany; no doubt to the outlying populations something was transmitted both of order and Christianity through the Germano-Papal connection. It is not for us to say whether this work could have been done otherwise.

Once more, when the Othos had ceased to reign, Italian independence delusively gleamed forth; and the brief sovereignty of Ardoin was added to those of Odoacer, of Theodoric, of the Berengarii. Another stormy precedent was made for that which has now at last and far more fully been carried into act. Thus it is evident that the principle of Nationality was never wholly lost in the far more general prevalence, during these ages, of the Imperial idea. It was always underlying the other, often practically superior, and sometimes, in these interregna, a patent fact. Though never a compact Nation, Italy was not always a "geographical expression."

Again Italian quarrels introduce the foreigners. Again a German dynasty, the Franconian, establishes itself for a moment secure. Under Henry III. we find for the last time the Empire and the Papacy in strict accord. But now the alliance is more than ever embarrassed with a faulty principle. For, in addition to the radical vice of the connection, an arbitrary system of Papal appointments by the Emperor is attempted. Other Emperors had *confirmed* Popes; Henry *appointed*. This brought its own embitterment of the struggle. The next reigns, in the fearful War of Investitures, witness the consequence. All Europe is convulsed with the conflict; all Europe at length accepts the compromise which closes the sanguinary strife. That compromise gave the Popes their period of highest grandeur. But it was short-lived. The Papacy had triumphed only to mount to the pinnacle of its glory, and then as suddenly to collapse.

The Hohenstaufen inherited the task of the Danaids —to fill with water a cask full of holes. The Imperial idea was strengthened afresh with every available help from the laws of Justinian, but the rents were more numerous than ever. Every Italian city supplied a rift. The Popes, too, had learnt a policy. They had leaped to power on the back of the Germans; they had shared power with them; they had quarrelled, triumphed; they were to destroy the Empire. In vain a gallant and honourable Barbarossa, embracing in good faith the most exalted idea of Imperialism, addresses himself to his task with heroic courage. The Pope and the Lombard cities humble him to the dust. In vain the grand political stroke of the Hohenstaufen is made, and the possession of South Italy along with

Germany appears certain at last to hem in and subdue the patriots; for such the Italians of the north and centre of the Peninsula,—the Pope himself would be a patriot now,—assuredly are; it is too late. The Crown of Sicily and Jerusalem does but add impetus to the fall of the Imperial House. No brilliant Frederick the Second with his glories of legislation, art, science, commerce, Universities, can arrest the fall. Italian interests are now too well united. The Lombard League and the Tuscan League are vigorous shoots of a National life, the noble promise of that which was one day to be. At length the most splendid, if not the greatest of the Emperors, the last of those whose representation of Imperialism has any reality, is hunted down, deposed in solemn council at Lyons, baffled in fight, dies miserably. The Great Interregnum, the German policy of Rodolph of Hapsburg, prevent its reimposition. The Imperial yoke is thrown off. The Holy Roman Empire is henceforth but a name. The French are to take its place in the affairs of Italy.

(3.) The Crusades had done much, not only to elevate the Papacy and depress the Empire, but to bring forward France. The War of Investitures prevented the Emperors from leading Europe at a time when they would have been the natural leaders. France, the French and Italian Normans, the Flemings, the minor German princes, came proportionably to the front. When an Emperor was able to take his Imperial place it was only to make an ignominious failure. The Kingdom of Jerusalem was French rather than Imperial. When at last a Barbarossa led the most hopeful enterprise yet attempted, he fell at the threshold of his destination. The Popes are the true heads of

Christendom, and not the Emperors. All had issued in favour of the Papacy. But that Papacy failed to perceive that the new arm on which it now relied must be to it once more what the German had been, first its tool and then its master. Puffed and swollen by a thousand successes, it was making its highest pretensions at the very moment of its collapse. Imagining that it could wield the weapons of an Innocent, it was ruined by the combined arrogance and impotence of a Boniface. It survived its old enemy scarcely half a century, and fell by the very means it had used in his destruction. When the fourteenth century opened with a French Pope at Avignon, it might have been perceived that the grandeur of the Papacy had for ever passed away. Men could hardly fail to observe that the balance had settled down at last in favour of the elder branch of the Franks, whose Kings were not called Emperors, but who had, perhaps, quite as much right as their neighbours to represent the Imperial idea.

This rise of French power was, directly or indirectly, the chief reason why all subsequent attempts to resuscitate the worn-out scheme of German Imperialism, and to make it practical south of the Alps, were each more and more ridiculous. They are chiefly interesting as they serve to note how poets and men of letters in the revival of literature were possessed with the ideas they discovered in their new studies, and how wonderfully their genius availed to give those ideas a fictitious importance. The Imperialist revival for some half-dozen years under Henry VII. was a romantic and feeble episode, a galvanized imitation of life, in great measure the handiwork of Dante and his compeers. The struggles of Louis IV. scarcely affected Italy. "He ran

the same course as his predecessors—a splendid coronation, the creation of an anti-Pope, an ignominious retreat quickening into flight, the wonder of mankind sinking at once into contempt."* The still more ignominious flight of Charles IV. through Italy was still more unheeded amidst the clash of the French and English wars. "All the Imperial rights in Italy were virtually abandoned."† Long before this, in reality long before the opening of the fourteenth century, the Germano-Italian Empire had sunk into the German. To view it in any other light is mere pedantry.

We have said that the Papacy, or at least the great mediæval fabric raised along with the Holy Roman Empire, fell with, or immediately after, its ally and rival. What the residence of the Popes at Avignon commenced, the schism in the Papacy completed. The period of General Councils announced that Nationalities had succeeded to the place of Imperialism. Germany and Italy voted at Constance as Nations. The form of an Emperor indeed remained. He was still the Premier Prince of Christendom, and received the honour of precedence, but he was now only the head of a Nation, often less potent than its other princes, and unrecognized as sovereign beyond the Alps. The form of the Papacy also remains, but how changed! During the "Captivity," the Popes had well-nigh lost even self-respect. When they returned to Rome it was but to divide. Christendom into parties acknowledging different Popes. Side by side with their lowered pretensions went a decline of their powers in matters merely spiritual. The scandals of their courts had eaten into the very heart of

* 'Latin Christianity,' Book xii., chap. 7.

† 'Ibid.' Book xii., chap. 11.

Europe. The old Imperial idea of the Church had worn out. Henceforth the Papal dominion was to be retained over but a portion of Western Europe, and to be of a different character over that part. Long before the Reformation, England and a great part of Germany owned but a qualified allegiance; and with the rest of Western Christendom the relations of Rome were too delicate to admit of much real interference on her part. With the growing Nationalities were reviving on all sides the claims of the National Churches, long in abeyance, but never forgotten. The Papal position which had been taken up under the Mediæval Empire of the West subsided and fell back into something of its pre-Carlovingian state.

Again let us turn to Italy. What was the effect in Italy of this collapse of Imperialism in Church and State? What legacy did it leave there? The direct rule of Transalpine Sovereigns had ceased for a time, but the Peninsula was filled with Transalpine troops, demoralized by the "Free Companies." Instead of one feeble master, each successful Captain of Condottieri acted, and in reality governed, as he pleased. But this also was working out an end. In various, and sometimes opposite, ways it gradually strengthened the petty Sovereignties which were taking the place of the Republics, and which, full of shameful and distressing history as they are, formed a link in that education which the principle of a whole Italian Nationality required. The parts must be integrated before the whole could bear the process.

It is indeed no pleasing picture which these various tyrannies present. The Popes, escaping with the skin of their teeth from the Councils, eagerly take refuge

in the new political system of Italy. Commencing a career of personal aggrandisement, they had their full share amongst the other tyrants in trampling out the liberties of Italy. It is true that the wealth and the material civilization of Italy make progress under this system; but individual freedom, self-government, complete Nationality,—above all, a National Church, are non-existent. They are to be repressed, that a longing for them may take a deeper root, and the ideas of the people expand beyond their own immediate sphere. Through the independent relations of Italian States is to be introduced by slow degrees that larger Italian spirit which was one day to be triumphant. Much the same process went on in Germany. The two countries, so long unnaturally connected, now stood in a very different relation both to Pope and Emperor from that in which they stood before. Neither Pope nor Emperor exercised in either country any of the power or even influence of previous centuries. The rivalry, the intercommunion, the wars and alliances of the various German and semi-German principalities which made up that shadowy and unwieldy Empire were of very much the same kind as those of Milan and Florence, of Venice and the Papal States, and French, afterwards Spanish, Naples. International law took its birth from these relations, and acquired a strength which was soon to be developed on a larger scale.

For a time, till the great nations of Europe were sufficiently consolidated, till the decaying notes of mediæval Imperialism had wholly passed away, Italy was permitted to gather up the fragments of her local strength. France, torn to pieces by the English and Burgundian wars, was as yet satisfied with the power

she exerted in Italy through the Papacy, and with the struggles of her royal princes for the Neapolitan crown. Aragon, the advanced guard of Spain, had planted herself in Sicily, and then in Naples, over provinces which, having obeyed Greeks, Saracens, Normans, Suabians, and French, were now to be that Kingdom of the Two Sicilies whose chequered history has left them an ever-recurring problem down to our own day. But though this was the most extensive and often the strongest power in Italy, it was but one part of her political system, a system held together by the balance of power within the Peninsula.

III. This brief phase of independence was also to pass away. The Modern Period begins. The National feeling, in times of feudal anarchy, had been sustained against foreign domination by occasional nominal sovereigns, later on, by the leagues of Republican cities, lastly, by the relations of independent States of great power. The increasing wealth and importance of these Principalities, and their ambitious cultivation of foreign alliances, once more draw down Transalpine hosts. Transalpine masters, no longer indeed professing to rule from Rome, content to dominate the Peninsula from the stronghold of the Italian Principalities, never again (till the year in which this Lecture is delivered) depart from the soil. The Papacy becomes the centre of all the intrigues which, during the fearful struggle of the nations in Italy, destroy its resources. At the end of those fatal five-and-thirty years (1494—1529), it is left no less a wreck than when, a thousand years before, the wars of Justinian and the Goths laid prostrate the civilization of the previous centuries. The Popes had raised themselves to this central position by means

worse, if possible, than any other in their long career. The crimes of their neighbours were imitated and even exceeded by the Priest-Kings. The violent policy of a Sixtus IV., the shocking depravity of the Borgias, the sanguinary wars of the martial Julius, the lettered indifference, to say the least, of a Leo X., were, at this period, to the moral reputation of the Papacy what the scandals of the courtesans Marozia and Theodora had been to it in earlier times. But its new political position, won at such cost of blood, treasure, and character, was too firmly fixed to be disturbed. It became the policy of the balanced forces of Europe to keep the Papacy as an established Italian power. And so, sometimes one great sovereign getting possession of it, sometimes another, sometimes these potentates agreeing upon joint or alternate elections, it has remained to our own day. The Pope himself trampled out the last spark of Italian liberty when, in conjunction with Charles V., he enslaved Florence (1529).

What are the new relations of this Italian principality and its head to Europe now that nations are formed under powerful monarchs? What becomes of the scattered fragments of the Papal Imperialism now that the Reformation has hammered it to pieces? The history may be summed up in a few words. The separate States gain what the Papacy had lost. In each country which still acknowledges the connection the State gains by Concordats much of that power which once the National Church, and then the Popes, had exercised. In France, for example, the Gallican Liberties are pretty equally divided between the Pope and the King. The governments generally became the agencies through which the Popes worked; and through

these governments, by the help of the Jesuits, they thus in time regain in these countries some portion of their ancient power.* The nations of the Reformation, cast off by Rome, or casting her off, go their own way, restoring their own National Churches after the Primitive model with more or less success, with more or fewer safeguards for the foundations of the faith in place of that which, such as it was, had been lost in the fall of the Papacy.

Meanwhile, the world becomes accustomed to a Pope in the position of an absolute Italian Prince, to Cardinals as Generals and Ambassadors, to a people under their rule devoid of liberty, a people handed over to them by the strong arm of the foreign powers with which they had intrigued. As a political power the Papacy becomes more and more insignificant. The Popes take a far higher moral position than of old, but they have dragged Italy down to their own political level. They share its insignificance. What is the history of that country ever since the Reformation but the history of other nations? What but the dull seat of Austrian, French, or Spanish rule or misrule, occasionally varied by the contests of their armies upon her plains? What but one long story of the struggle of French and German interests? Then at length the French Revolution bursts upon Italy as on the rest of the world, and the interference of the elder branch of the Franks once more becomes effective in destroying the dominion of the younger. Fresh ideas germinate. Another Empire is raised on the ruins of another Republic. The claim of Charlemagne is once more repeated with much about the same right as in the Germany of former days. The

* See Ranke's 'Popes,' *passim*.

chief difference is that it is by so many more years an anachronism. Strange old, along with strange new titles are heard for a time in the Italian Peninsula. Again a Pope must attend the coronation of an Emperor; again the Papacy must be chained, whether it will or not, to Imperialism—the Imperialism of the nineteenth century; again the residence of the Pope shall be on the soil of France. And, again, the mighty fabric of a day dissolves like snow.

Napoleon is gone. Once more, and for the last time, the heel of triumphant Germany presses on Italy. Her education is not completed. Long years of slavery must not be forgotten in a moment. The stern Austrian repression of that larger National sentiment which the Revolution had called forth again threatens to prevail. But the time had passed. The last effort of the Germans and of the Spanish Bourbons is also the briefest. Again waves of convulsion, echoes of the Revolution, shake down the thrones of Europe. A Pope himself leads the way to liberty. The House of Savoy which, chiefly by the accidents of its position, had alone of Italian houses escaped slavery, and which had in the course of ages slowly grown to the first place in Italy, again plays the part of Berengarius and Ardoin, but with better success. And now a new French Emperor pants to reproduce Napoleon and Charlemagne. He also must chase a monarch from Lombardy. He also must take up the place in Italy due to the elder branch of the Franks. He also must represent the Roman element, which his people so largely share, at the great old Roman centre from whence it first radiated. He also must exhibit to Europe his patronage of a Pope, and keep down with French bayonets that Roman popu-

lation which has seldom obeyed a Pope except when it was obliged.

But what, spite of himself, seems to enlarge and modify each of the ideas of this last Napoleon, to carry a step further what he apparently intended should stand still? As men say, events are too strong for him! Is this all? Can we give no other account of it? Surely we are witnessing, we of to-day, the ripening of the great design! Surely all things have been working up to this Italian Unity and Independence which is now at last, under our very eyes, all but accomplished! Surely all things have been working up to this virtual dissolution of the Temporal Power of the Papacy now gradually but surely taking place! As each phase of the long series passes away, a recurrence seems more and more impossible. The spell of a designed settlement seems to hang upon the approaching order of things.

Has not a consideration of the past prepared us for this conclusion? The Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes, as we may see even from this brief survey, has certainly been hitherto the main cause of Transalpine interference with Italy, of Italian disunion, Italian slavery. At every crisis we trace its influence. If it turns against the power it has introduced, the effect of the introduction nevertheless too surely remains. So far from having made the Pope independent, this position has made him the puppet of kings. It has been the fertile excuse for every crime. Even from a Roman Catholic point of view it has surrounded the true dignity of the Papacy with all the vulgar accessories of temporal government. It has been an anomaly, an unnatural phenomenon. It has turned Popes into warriors and intriguing statesmen, the Papal clergy into secular

functionaries, men who profess to be above family ties into unblushing nepotists, men who claim infallibility into the deliverers of the most contradictory judgments.

Is it not logical to suppose that when this cause of error is removed, some at least of the evils it has carried with it may be removed too? Without approving of all the means by which the change has been effected, may we not look forward to happier days for Italy, "free from the Alps to the Adriatic"? Is there not something which tells every Englishman that foreign domination can exist no longer there after such a deliverance? Has not the public opinion of all Europe—a daily increasing power—settled down into a conviction that there must be an entire and final withdrawal of France and Germany from the new kingdom? May we not also look forward to some alteration of position on the part of the Papacy in this far humbler but far more honourable stage of its existence? Who can refuse to feel at least some sympathy with him on whom, in his old age, the whole weight of the chequered past is now falling? May we not hope from him or his successors some return to primitive times, some recognition of the independence of those National Churches which, having retained the ancient inheritance, have never ceased to appeal to an Œcumenical Council? May we not expect some attempt at solving the problem of combining Universality and Nationality suited to the age at which mankind has arrived? Surely we may, though as yet we see it not. All history points to it. The Nations will demand it—Clergy and Laity alike—and who shall say them nay?

We cannot conclude this rapid sketch of the conflicts of Western Christendom without turning our thoughts

once more to the East. Does not a candid survey of the great Schism of East and West confirm the views expressed above? Nothing is so futile, nothing so superficial, as to gather up the causes of that separation into a single act, or even series of acts, to speak of the Oriental Church as the "Photian Heresy," to name a date, or a reign, or a Pontificate, or a Council, or a Crusade, as the point of departure. It was no doubt the result of a multitude of causes, each woven into the other, and extending over hundreds of years. It was as much National as Ecclesiastical, political as religious. It was part of that gradual unfolding of the relations between Unity and Individuality of which we have spoken in Western Europe. It is vain for us to see in it nothing but what is distressing. A particular notion of Visible Unity was to be destroyed, and we may, perhaps, see why. Such fragments of it as were still suited to the needs of the world were to be preserved for a time. But the rivalry of capitals, the jealousy of races, the passions of particular men, the profound influence of apparently trivial points of custom and ceremonial, the so-called accidents of war, the rise of fresh Nationalities (border-lands of territory between the two communions, embittering the strife for their own interests), the hollow, polished, decaying civilization of the one population as contrasted with the rude, vigorous, progressive character of the other, the different views entertained by either party in the common struggle with the various developments of Mahometan force—all these and a thousand other such things for ever baffled the political and the religious attempts at union so often made on both sides. They baffled the policy of Emperors, German and Byzan-

tine, the strenuous efforts of Councils, the honest, pious endeavours of good men, Popes and Patriarchs, clergy and laity alike. If we may so dare to interpret history, we see that through all the elements of opposition the Christian world was to learn that the "faith once delivered" was to be preserved by the balance of more Communions than one; that when the National Churches were sufficiently organized, when the old idea of Visible Unity had played its appointed part, these Churches were to be a mutual support and protection, to supply what was deficient in one another from the basis of Intercommunion. The position to which every event has been gradually leading up, the position of National Church Independence freely and mutually recognised, with all the modifications of liturgy and rite and custom peculiar to each, a Union of all such Churches on the footing of the Primitive Creeds and the Primitive Councils, seems at last, by the force of events in the East and in the West, to be dawning upon the age.

What a future will then be in store for the world when this last act of the closing drama is announced! What force will Christendom then exert on the masses of heathendom! And, if aroused by the separate, yet harmonious action of the Churches, the rebel powers of Secularism join those of ignorant Paganism and modernised Mahometanism, and gather themselves up for one last struggle, what will this be but the expected sign that the end is near, and that the "stone cut out without hands" is at last about to "consume all these kingdoms," and to "stand for ever"?

That there are signs abroad of a realization of some of these notions, which a very few years ago would have been thought perfectly Utopian, no one will deny. An

age seldom fully perceives what it is actually producing, and this age is crowding vast events one upon another with a rapidity accorded to few of its predecessors. It is not beyond the province of history to take notice of such facts. History is, indeed, concerned with the past, but it reads the past in the light of the present. The connection between that past and this present is a fair subject for our consideration. At any rate we shall not be the worse for raising our eyes to an elevation which may shew us something on either side of the enclosed highway. If the view here given of the conflict of the Imperial and National principles, of the rise and growth of the Temporal Power of the Papacy, and its historical relations with Germany, France, and Italy, if the connection of this mighty past with the extraordinary changes now going on are any assistance towards the formation of worthy expectations for the future, a few minutes' attention will not have been bestowed in vain.

LECTURE VI.

THE NATIONAL CHARACTER OF THE OLD ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES.

NOVEMBER 16, 1867.*

DR. DÖLLINGER, in a recent work,† after explaining the difference between the German and English Universities (very much, of course, to the disadvantage of the latter), proceeds thus:—

"In mentioning these points I have no desire to find fault with the English Universities. On the contrary, I consider them excellent of their sort, and well adapted to supply what the nation demands from them. I would only point out that they are totally different from the German institutions of the same name—that, at any rate, they approach more nearly to the mediæval Universities, and have retained more mediæval characteristics than the German Societies; and that these last correspond to the idea of a 'High School,' as it may and ought to be realised in the nineteenth century, far better than the English Universities. At the same time I will not conceal the fact that those renovated and improved editions of the old, and now unfortunately extinct, German bursaries, the Colleges of Oxford and

* This Lecture appeared in 'Blackwood's Magazine,' March, 1868.

† 'Universities Past and Present.' By J. J. Ignatius Döllinger, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, &c. Translated by C. E. C. R. Appleton, B.C.L. Rivingtons.

Cambridge, have many a time, as I observed their working on the spot, awakened in me feelings of envy, and led me to long for the time when we might again have something of the kind; for I could plainly perceive that their effect was to make instruction take root in the mind and become a part of it, and that their influence extended beyond the mere communication of knowledge, to the ennobling elevation of life and character. I have often asked myself why we Germans are so slow to adopt an institution recommended alike by reason and experience—an institution which saves thousands of fathers and mothers from sleepless nights of anxiety and sorrow, which rescues many a young man from ruin or from life-long remorse."

Whether we agree with this great German authority or not, whether we accept his praise or his blame, or both, it may not be amiss to attempt to gather within the compass of a Lecture the main causes of a phenomenon which calls forth such remarkable words. How is it that while, according to this competent author's own account, the life of the German Universities is deficient in the important elements which he finds in ours, and is, after all, but a thing of yesterday—a fitful life of little more than a century — a life, as other witnesses tell us, of wild, turbulent, ever-fluctuating excitement, which concentrates the intellectual life of the whole people very much within University walls, and certainly fails in diffusing it through the mass of upper-class society,* while the Universities of all other countries except Germany and England have fallen into

* Evidence of Dr. Perry before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education Bill. Special Report, &c., 1867.

decay, being either travestied by a ministerial bureaucracy as in France, or existing elsewhere in a state admitted by all to be beneath contempt,—how is it that, while all this is so on the Continent, Oxford and Cambridge are still, after surviving revolution upon revolution, and after presenting an unbroken line of continuity from the remotest period of our history, still "excellent of their sort, and well adapted to supply what the nation demands from them"? History must give us the answer. It is in considerations arising out of the history of these great institutions that we shall find what we are seeking. It is by a calm review of such considerations that those who have to deal with their reform or improvement will best fulfil their responsibilities.

Happily there is at hand as much material as could be expected in tracing back so ancient a history. No institution has ever had such antiquarians as those of whom Oxford boasts. There is little probability of any serious addition being made to their researches. Histories have been compiled from their materials, from the Statutes of the Realm, from the stray hints of mediæval chroniclers, and from the archives of Colleges, as well as from more modern biographies and local traditions; and this by every variety of writer. Later still we have had the elaborate Report of a Royal Commission, which has based many of its suggestions upon history; while, to balance its somewhat one-sided conclusions, we have the Report of the University Authorities, who were put on their defence by the Reformers of 1850. And now a new Blue-book on University questions* brings us up to the point from which

* Special Report, &c., 1867.

we may best regard the contrast between our own and the foreign Universities which Dr. Döllinger has made. If we refer more to the University of Oxford than to that of Cambridge, we must shelter ourselves under the excuse of the latest and best historian of the Universities, Professor Huber—viz., that on all main points the history of one is that of the other. It may be added that their points of difference do but illustrate the considerations with which we are chiefly concerned in this Lecture.*

The vitality of the English Universities must no doubt be ascribed very largely to what we must call, for want of a better word, their Nationality. They have grown with the growth, strengthened with the strength, decayed with the decay, risen with the rise of the Nation, from the earliest moment of their history down to the last. Every pulse of the national life has throbbed through these bodies; every prejudice, every national fault, has found its image there; every reform has been initiated or furthered there,—sometimes not the less furthered because for the moment opposed. If England has been governed by her Parliaments, she has been also governed, more than is generally thought, by her Universities. Either in her past or present, England would be scarcely England without them. It has been so both in Church and State. The Universities have equally shared the progress, the vicissitudes of

* Since this Lecture was delivered, a collection of "Munimenta Academica, or Documents illustrative of Academical Life and Studies at Oxford," has been printed, in the series of publications by the Master of the Rolls, under the superintendence of the Rev. H. Anstey, who has contributed a useful Preface, stating what may be gathered from these documents as to the internal condition of the University in the Middle Ages.

both. In dealing with the English Universities, men touch the very nerves and fibres which lace and interlace the whole Constitution of the realm.

We will not stop to discuss the antiquity of these venerable bodies. We may be content to make a protest against the pedantry which refuses to acknowledge the importance of Oxford as a place of education in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman times, merely because no public document in which it is recognized as a University is found earlier than the thirteenth century. It is only necessary to quote the carefully-formed opinion of Huber, that the traditional connection between Oxford as a place of education and King Alfred has never been disproved, and that there are sufficient indirect proofs of it to satisfy any reasonable mind.* That Oxford shared with the entire country, and had more than her proper share, of the horrors of the Danish and Norman Conquests, and that these affected the inhabitants of Oxford, not merely like any other city, but the city through the scholars assembled there; that the re-establishment of the city by the Normans as a place of military strength was quickly succeeded by a resumption of its scholastic character under the auspices of the astute Beauclerc, whose palace at Beaumont sufficiently proves his close connection with the place; and that, if all other evidence were wanting, an ancient and important history must necessarily be supposed, if we are to understand how Oxford could have become, except by magic, a centre in which the new study of Civil Law

* It has been somewhat too hastily concluded that the discovery of the spuriousness of certain authorities on which the old champions of the antiquity of Oxford relied, has invalidated all other grounds of belief.

could make itself a home in a reign of bitter and scarce intermitted civil war like that of Stephen;—all this we shall take for granted. It is sufficient for our purpose to observe, that when the new Norman family had fairly established itself,—when, under its first four princes, the rude elements of force in the body politic had so far completed their struggle that the way was prepared for the operations of the great founder of the English Constitution,—that founder, Henry II., amongst the various portions of the national fabric which he left in shape, left also the two Universities. With the earliest infancy of our august Courts of Law,—with the formation of the Common, and the introduction of the Civil and Canon Law,—with the institution of orderly legal trials in place of the rude Norman appeal of battle and the Saxon ordeal,—with the great settlement of the relations of Church and State effected by Henry,—with the close French connection and the initiation of a foreign policy, traceable from that time through all periods of our history, which we equally owe to him,—with the rise of the Scholastic Philosophy, and the vast impulse given by it and the Civil Law to the mind of the twelfth century;—with all this—and these are but a few of the leading characteristics of that central epoch—the Universities of England, no longer in their infancy, but in the pride of a vigorous and well-developed existence, are synchronous. Fitted by a long past history for her task, and having, as we cannot but believe, already borne a considerable part in the progress of the nation, Oxford now started on that career which we are henceforth able to trace with ever-increasing light, while Cambridge began to emulate her activity, and both to cultivate the closest intercourse with the

greater, though but little older, University of Paris, from which so many of their early customs were derived.

We have lingered a moment over this confessedly indistinct period of University life, because it is scarcely possible to overrate the importance of such institutions as Universities being connected with the actual birth and infancy of a nation. On the points of early University life, growth, identification with a nation, and continuousness for many centuries, the glorious history of Paris offers the only parallel with that we have just noticed; but the retrospect is clouded by the memory of its fall. It had concentrated everything within itself. It had no sister University to support it when the storm of the Revolution came. Its roots had long ceased to strike into the more fertile portions of French soil. Its fall was irremediable.*

The most conspicuous mark of the Nationality of the English Universities at this period (the end of the twelfth and the thirteenth century), is the increasing frequency and regularity of their connection with the strongest power in the nation—the Crown. This was chiefly brought about under the pressure of the unceasing struggle which was taking place between the Universities and the towns in which they had been founded. Under the earlier Plantagenets, indeed, the patronage of the Crown seems to have been pretty equally divided between the University of Oxford and

* A popular sketch in English of the history of the University of Paris is a desideratum. The bulky folios of Bulæus still remain—like those of Wood for Oxford—the source to which inquirers are obliged to turn. Neither Crevier nor Dubarle has done for Paris what Huber has done for the English Universities; Dubarle, indeed, was dealing with a body already dead.

the City, for we find Richard I., in grateful memory of his birth and early education at that place, not only granting incorporation to the scholars, the seal* of which charter is referred to in authentic documents, but also to the civic authorities, placing them on the same footing as those of London, and making the mayor butler at his coronation,† while his successors frequently knighted that functionary. It is clear that the City of Oxford was within a very little of taking a place in the civic history of England only second to that of London, and that it only lost its place by that connection with the University which first gave it importance. The fierce, continuous, traditional struggles between the two bodies, pent up within the same walls, and neither of them willing, nor indeed able, without the application of some force external to themselves, to give way, necessitated the humiliation of one or the other; and as the nation could not do without the Universities, the strength of the Crown was put forth in their favour. They had always one remedy, which, like the Romans of old, they never failed to apply when hard pressed,—that of Secession. Unsupported in the struggle with the city in the reign of John,—who, instead of befriending, exercised his accustomed reckless tyranny on the scholars,—a large portion migrated to Cambridge, giving a great impulse to that University, just as Oxford itself,

* "Sigillum Cancellarii et Universitatis Oxoniensis." This is referred to by Wood, p. 48, who says the document mentioning the common seal of the University of Oxford, and dated 1190, was *in manibus authoris.*

† 'Ayliffe,' p. 34. Wood assigns the grant of this privilege to Henry II., and says it was taken from the city by Richard I. at his second coronation in 1194. Hoveden only speaks of the citizens of London as doing the butlery at Richard's coronations.

both before and after that time, received valuable accessions from Paris. Later on, great numbers migrated from Oxford to Northampton, and, later still, to Stamford.* Reading, Maidstone, and Salisbury also received Oxford scholars, though not to the same extent as the places first named. But the Nation had made up its mind. Through its kings, using force when necessary, the drain was stopped, and the scholars were always sent back to their old homes. From the beginning of the thirteenth century downwards, charters upon charters, confirmations upon confirmations, almost with the regularity of the confirmations of Magna Charta itself, attested the royal and national sense of the importance of the Universities.

The separation of England from North France, with which the thirteenth century opened, changed the form of connection which had hitherto subsisted between Paris and the English Universities,—

> "Et procul et propius jam Francus et Anglicus eque,
> Norunt Parisiis quid feceris Oxonieque;" †

but the rivalry of the two States which now prevailed offered a ready opportunity for one or the other literary republic, whenever the strong arm of its own State was felt to be intolerable, to throw its migratory bodies across the Channel. The long reign of Henry III. was to the Universities what it was to everything else in England, the period of struggle between the various forces of society, now organised in the form which they were, in

* Some notices of the collegiate character impressed on Stamford by these migrations will be found in the 'Memorials of Stamford,' by the Rev. Mackenzie Walcott.

† Wood, i. 207.

the main, afterwards to retain. The royal power had dwindled to the smallest proportions it had exhibited since the Conquest, and the Nationality of England, produced by the loss of Normandy, had begun to develop itself freely on every side. The blood of the nation rallied to the heart. Oxford became the intellectual and political centre of the great contest. The halls, inns, or hostels, which Huber declares distinguished from their earliest infancy the English from all other Universities, began to multiply exceedingly; thus, under a rude form, ripening and strengthening that principle of a *common life* which was afterwards to bear such important fruits. The Friars were now firmly planted in addition to the Monks, whose institutions had so powerfully influenced the early days of the Universities. Scholars flocked in from all parts of the world. The ancient system of division into two Nations, North and South, each with its Proctor, is found in full operation. The Universities are the great centres of education, doing the duty of schools for the young, as well as homes for adult students, in an age when everybody was inquiring and learning with an activity of mind more remarkable, it has been said, than in our own day. They swallow up the Cathedral Schools, and draw all within their vortex.

Never were the Universities more truly National than at this time; but it was the nationality of an age from which our own is separated by a huge gulf of manners and customs as well as years. Herded in these halls or inns, much after the fashion of cattle, or living in holes and corners such as are nowadays inhabited by the most degraded class of the poor, the young noble with his military pomp of retainers jostling against the poor

student supported on daily alms, and the confusion of the whole realm only too truly typified in its intellectual centres, it was a wild tumultuous life, an encampment rather than a settlement, a swarm of wild bees rather than an orderly hive. Tumults and battles of course there were under these circumstances almost without end; battles, not with fists or stones (or even life-preservers), but with swords, and bows and arrows, and many killed and wounded on either side; the organization of armies, the wild rough habits of civil war. There never was wanting an occasion for a combat. The old hereditary feuds between the University and the city offered of course the most frequent opportunities; but if that failed, there were numerous excellent quarrels in reserve. The Seculars against the Regulars, and especially against the Friars, with whom for a century after their introduction there was a constant struggle, the University against the officers of the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of the diocese; School against School, as the Nominalists against the Realists; Faculty against Faculty, as Law against Medicine; above all, Nation against Nation, or parts of a Nation against other parts.

It was this latter sort of faction fight which probably gave rise to the well-known proverb which connects Oxford disturbances with those of the realm.* The North and South of England had each its own characteristics proceeding from National circumstances, dating, indeed, from the rivalry of the Angles and Saxons, and ready to break out in Oxford, or in the nation at large,

* "Chronica si penses, cum pugnant Oxonienses,
Post paucos menses volat ira per Angligenenses."
—Wood, i. 258.

on the slightest provocation. Thus in times of civil war, which a very little historical knowledge will enable us to connect with this old quarrel of race, Oxford of course took its part; while at other times the local causes of division already named rallied on either side the hereditary enemies who had come to Oxford from either side of the Trent. The resistance to the Papacy came chiefly from the Northerners, who included the Scotch, while the South English, reinforced by the Welsh, Irish, and Continental scholars, were its supporters. Even Nominalism and Realism were found to have a hidden connection with the points of the compass; and Northerners, by a strange fatality, were bound to be Realists, though reformers; while Southerners must be Nominalists, in spite of the use so often made of Nominalism against the Romanism they supported. It would be interesting, if we had time, to follow up the hints given us by the historians, and trace in detail how these prime differences shaded off, as time went on and local distinctions disappeared, the Popery of the one party into Jacobitism and Toryism, the Reforming proclivities of the other into Hanoverianism and Whiggery. Nor were the studies which succeeded the Scholastic Philosophy exempt from the same partisanship; the introduction of Greek being patronized fiercely by the Southerners, while as stoutly resisted by the men of the North, under the name of Trojans.

Hence also is deduced the difference between Oxford and Cambridge; and the tendencies of the Scotch Universities, when the time came for their foundation, may be traced to the same source. The Northerners, drawing their forces from a smaller and poorer area, were generally in a minority, and more often went to the wall.

Unable to brook inferiority, they migrated elsewhere—to Cambridge, or, later on, to Scotland, carrying with them their traditional principles, their ancient enmities.

There was, however, a better side of the picture. Not only in Oxford itself, but throughout the island, the antagonism of the two great principles of stability and progress was diffused. The inestimable advantage was secured throughout our mediæval and modern history, of having both sides of these great principles thoroughly advocated. Public opinion formed itself under the auspices of a literary class. Our political Constitution felt the impulse. The great divisions of party government to which this country owes so much of its later glory and advancement may not indeed have had their sole or even principal origin in, but they certainly derived vigour from, this root,—deep down below the surface, unobserved and forgotten, but none the less surely doing its work.

What, however, was the effect on the Universities themselves of this tumultuous life? No doubt it fixed deep in their constitution the sentiment that they had rights and privileges to guard—the truly English sense of being bound to stand up and do battle for principles, whatever they are. No doubt it fostered the idea of a republic of letters—the conception of the dignity of literature. No doubt there was a charm about this boisterous, swash-buckler life, an expansion of ideas arising from the fact of being in the very centre of the life of the nation. No doubt the rivalry of the renowned teachers of Philosophy and Theology was a stimulus to their own exertions and the attention of the scholars. No doubt, in short, the system, or rather no-system, was not unsuitable for the rude age in which it flourished.

But the evils were palpable; they soon became intolerable. As manners improved, public opinion declared against this tumultuous life; order was to take the place of disorder—kings and their chancellors were to vie with each other in remedying the abuses of these now great and famous Universities. As under the three Edwards the old rude outline of the Constitution was moulded into the shape it still for the most part retains, so under these monarchs the present Collegiate character of the Universities took its development. Let us trace the events of this period in some detail.

In the Civil War of Henry III.'s reign we find Oxford in the main a faithful representative of the nation in resisting that happy series of "Papal aggressions" which once and for ever opened the eyes of Englishmen to the true nature of the Papacy. In 1238 the Bishops of England take the part of Oxford against the vindictive Legate (who, indeed, had not been too well treated), declaring it to be "the second school of the Church"—Paris being the first—"the maintainer of piety and learning most famous over the world." Later on, the influence of Grosseteste and Montfort carries the whole University with it, and makes Oxford the centre of the national struggle. No less than four Parliaments are held there in Henry III.'s reign. With the rest of the nation its glad obedience to Edward I. showed that resistance had been founded on real grievances, and was unconnected with any disaffection to the Crown as such. One of the steps taken by our Kings at this period—it was first taken at Cambridge—was to inhibit tournaments in both Universities—a step towards discountenancing their warlike habits. Exemption from tallages is also claimed and gained. Edward I. so far favours the

scholars at the expense of the citizens, that he inhibits the latter from using for any other purpose dwellings once let to scholars. As a part of his war policy in the conquest of Scotland, he refused to let the Scotch students leave the place, for fear they might "by a foreign education be poisoned with State innovations." Before he became king* he had mediated between the University and citizens of Cambridge.

Edward II. seems to have taken great interest in Oxford. Oriel College is said to have owed its foundation to the vow he made during his flight of sixty miles, with the Douglas at his heels, from Bannockburn. This may or may not be true; but, at his deposition, while the University takes his part and the citizens that of Mortimer, it is certain that all lectures are stopped for several months. Edward III. had, it is said, studied at Oxford as a boy, under Walter Burley, and owed much of his education to Richard of Bury, a great benefactor of Oxford. He thus naturally took that place under his special protection as soon as his throne was secure. It is he who refuses to allow Stamford to erect itself, as it ardently desired, into a rival University, well knowing the danger of a centre for Northern feeling. "It is not our pleasure that schools or studies be held anywhere than in places where the Universities now are"—a resolution similar to that he took with regard to staple-towns. If the infancy of commerce required protection and concentration at the bidding of what was a sound political economy for that day, much more did the young manhood of University education. "Edward III.," says Ayliffe, "deserves to be preferred before all his predecessors on account of his patronage

* Cooper's 'Annals of Cambridge.'

and many liberalities conferred hereon." Some go so far as to reckon him amongst the Oxford authors of this period, as having written a work on laws, and some epistles.

To him belonged the task of putting an end to the battles of centuries between the University and City of Oxford. The wars of Edward I., as well as his own, had turned Englishmen of the middle class into skilled soldiers. Welles in the first reign, and Bereford in the second, were fit captains for battles such as were now fought. We need not dwell on the terrors of the "Great Conflict" of St. Scholastica's Day, 1353, which the graphic pages of Wood have made sufficiently familiar; but it may be remarked, that the way seems to have been prepared for this frightful struggle* (which reminds us rather of a Sepoy Mutiny or the French Revolution than of an ordinary English fight) by the internecine contests which had shortly before taken place between, not only the rival factions of scholars, but the masters and scholars—the last being one of the most sanguinary as well as discreditable of the whole series. The terrible plague of 1350, which reduced the University to less than one-fourth of its usual numbers, had also, in all probability, a great effect on the issue; for the disparity of numbers when the City was reinforced by the rude inhabitants of the surrounding villages, tempted the one party to a desperate resistance and the other to an indiscriminate vengeance. All this was to cease. The very gravity of the evil worked its cure. Henceforth the City was unmistakably to submit to the University,

* The battle lasted three days, and ended in the complete victory of the City, aided as it was by some two thousand rustics marshalled under a black banner.

and the sign of its submission, long a galling badge of its humiliation, has only been removed in our own day.*

These wars, however, left another and a much more permanent as well as important mark. The necessity of a Collegiate life was, as we have said, forced upon the minds of all thoughtful men. The scandals attaching to a Republican Church Militant were too much even for that fighting age, and the contrast presented on the one hand by the Colleges, as they were founded one after another, and on the other hand by the inhabitants of the old Halls and the loose hordes of "Chamberdekyns" (*camera degentes*) outside the walls of both Halls and Colleges, was daily becoming more remarkable. The work achieved by Walter de Merton at Oxford in the thirteenth century, carrying with it issues so far beyond what that great man could have foreseen, and soon afterwards wisely imitated by the foundation of Peterhouse at Cambridge, had made itself felt by the end of the fourteenth century. Six noble institutions (University, Balliol, Merton, Exeter, Oriel, and Queen's) had witnessed at Oxford to the public spirit of kings and queens, clergymen and statesmen; and now William of Wykeham was to surpass them all. His College, founded on a grander scale than its predecessors, and with statutes of a more stringent character, "so that it well deserved to be called New," became the model of

* The oath to respect the privileges of the University taken each year since the "Great Conflict" by the incoming Mayor to the Vice-Chancellor was dispensed with by the University a few years ago. Within the memory of the present generation the Mayor used annually to present the Vice-Chancellor at St. Mary's Church with sixty-three silver pennies, in memory of the number of masters and scholars slain in the Great Conflict. The number slain was, however, in all probability much greater.

the great founders of the next century. It gave a most serious blow to the non-Collegiate system, which dragged on but a degraded existence till the reign of Elizabeth. By that time the Colleges had practically become the University. The statutes of Laud did but surround with the force of law what custom and circumstances had brought about of themselves.

Among these circumstances we must give a prominent place to the vast and sudden diminution of the number of students which occurred soon after the middle of the fourteenth century, and to which we have already referred. Without endorsing the celebrated statement about the 30,000 scholars who are said to have been at Oxford in the earlier part of the century, there is plenty of evidence that the numbers were very great, and that they had been very greatly reduced by the end of it. This diminution has been ascribed to various causes, such as the allurements of the Friars, who attracted students to their Societies without the consent of their parents, to the dearness of provisions, and to the prevalence of another sort of Provisions, the system by which the Pope "provided" for the incumbency of Livings, and thus prevented University men from obtaining them. The state of constant warfare above described, added to the incessant pestilences brought on by the filthy state of the place, would be of themselves, however, sufficient to account for it, if the same causes had not existed all along. But they had become intensified at this period, and the civil disorders of the country after the failure of the French wars, culminating in the disturbances of Richard II.'s reckless reign, could not but have their effect on the Universities. If these storms of the larger area had not been felt in the

smaller, it would indeed have been one mark the less of that Nationality which we are now tracing. The decline in the number of University students favoured the rise of the Colleges, whilst the rise of these latter reacted against any rally in the numbers of the former. On the one hand the unused Halls were easily bought up, and their sites absorbed by the Colleges, while the larger space these bodies began to fill as the others sank away gave the recommendation of success. Nor only had they in their favour the fashion of the day, the patronage of the great, and the visible space they filled in the public eye, but they might well claim the lion's share of the great names of which the University had had to boast. Before any other College had time to make a fame, Merton counts among the 8 men of Oxford most celebrated during Edward I.'s reign for being versed in the learning of their day, 2 of her own sons; in Edward II.'s reign she reckoned 4 out of 21; and in Edward III.'s, 9 out of 52, and amongst these are the greatest names of the age. The other Colleges were beginning to emulate Merton. Everything went to further this great change.

Two other circumstances, coincident with the rise of the Colleges, throw light upon the movement. Oxford had been the centre of the great Pre-Reformation struggle. Round Wicliff had gathered all those Northern elements of opposition to Papal oppression which had existed from the first, the old Anglo-Saxon National-Church feeling. The struggle was perhaps even more severe than when the Reformation at last came. Richard II.'s letters to the University, urging the expulsion of Wicliff and his friends, are constant and pressing. All eyes were directed towards the scene of a

conflict such as the world had not witnessed for a thousand years. The silencing of the Reformers was at last achieved, but at the expense of the *numbers* of the University. And, secondly, this Collegiate system took its rise, or rather obtained its development, at a time when the French wars of Edward III. had completed the separation between this country and France. Henceforth the hostility between the two nations was continuous. No dynasty could hold its own unless it made war, or pretended to make war, with the national enemy. French disappeared from our Courts of law; and Wicliff and Chaucer, two thoroughbred University men, reduced our vernacular nearly to its present form; England rose to the measure of its full height; became more self-contained, more self-sufficing. The Universities felt the National change. The French and Continental students were now seldom seen within their precincts; and even the provincials took up a different position at Oxford. Some of the last faction fights were between the Welsh and the Northerners, and between the University and the Irish Chamberdekyns. This again acted in furtherance of the new Collegiate system, which was more aristocratic and exclusive, though designed and still chiefly used for poor men, than the democratic Republic. We are at no loss then to perceive how at this period the Universities presented a true image of the Nation.

The Fifteenth Century may be taken as standing by itself, as much in University as in National history. It is the period of transition from mediæval to modern times, the period of reaction from the turmoil which had attended the Wicliff struggle, the period of repression, only to be succeeded by a far more tremendous

explosion, of attempts to govern the Church by General Councils, quickly followed by assertions of Papal power more intolerable than ever before, of new discoveries, of changes in the routes of commerce and the organization of States, of foreign and civil wars, under cover of which English society was marching out of its ancient into its modern condition. How completely do the Universities in this century reflect the Nation! If kings and statesmen are rallying round the old Church in the cause of order, they combine in making these institutions the very centre of their operations. If the English voice is to be heard, fresh from the fame of Agincourt, at the European Councils, to the Universities it must look for a tongue.* If the grievous troubles of the nation have depressed the cultivation of literature, it is here where such depression is most felt. The very drain by which so much of the life of the Universities is drawn off, is significant. The metropolis, so influential in determining the issues of many a national struggle, fast growing in wealth and importance in spite of all the national woes, carries off in this century the professions of Law and Medicine, now becoming divorced from their ecclesiastical connection,† never to return in any force to their old homes. Parallel with the social movement which, when the people emerged out of the Wars of the Roses, threw off the national feudality and chivalry,

* Hallam, the famous Bishop of Salisbury, who so ably represented England at the Council of Constance, "the right hand of the Emperor," who alone held together the Germans and the English (Milman's 'Latin Christianity,' vi. 19, 62), and Abendon, who carried the precedence of England over Spain at the Council, were Oxford men.

† Ayliffe's 'History of the University of Oxford,' and Hook's 'Archbishops of Canterbury,' vols. iv. and v. *passim.*

the Universities cast off the old literature and took up the new. The Colleges, under the shadow of which the Theology and Philosophy of the Middle Ages had withered and decayed, became, at the end of the century, the homes of the "new learning," the living centres from which that learning, and the Reformation of which it was the parent, were diffused throughout the land.

The rapid sequence of the foundation of Colleges marks this era at both Universities. Archbishop Chichele proved a worthy successor of Wykeham, and seems to have set the tone of Oxford almost as influentially as that remarkable man. Waynflete passed on the torch from him to Wolsey. With these great ecclesiastical statesmen for patrons, the Universities were now more than ever identified with the Nation ecclesiastically. In 1437 Henry VI., under Chichele's guidance, directs a letter from Woodstock to the Archbishop and his suffragans, complaining of the diminution of the number of students at both Universities, and exhorting them to make such provision from the Church's patrimony as would make the University degree an advantage. Next year, in consequence, it was decreed in Synod that all patrons should be obliged for ten years to confer benefices exclusively on Graduates, and the time was extended still further in a later Synod.

The Lancastrian family was in all its branches eminently favourable to the Universities. Beaufort and Gloucester, if they agreed on no other point, vied with each other on this. Cardinal Beaufort is as clearly associated with our Divinity School as Gloucester with the Bodleian Library. Their work has been superseded, but what we possess owes its origin to them. "Gloucester," says Ayliffe, "was never wanting to sup-

port us in cases of the greatest difficulty." Henry V. is stated to have been Beaufort's pupil at Oxford, and probably owed some of his great conceptions both to tutor and University. Both he and his father left marks of their reign at that place. In consequence of the plot laid by Richard's friends at Oxford, Henry IV. forbade the attendance of any great number of servants except on certain occasions, including the meeting of Convocation; and in Henry V.'s reign, in order to put an end to the constant plague of the Irish Chamberdekyns, a University statute was passed, based on an Act of Parliament, by which "whoever had their diet in any college or hall, they should stay there all night"—"whence the halls of these" (Chamberdekyns), "of which there were many, sensibly decayed apace."* Thus the way was left completely open for the new Colleges springing up on every side. Henry VI., himself educated (it is said) at Oxford, and brought up at the feet of Beaufort and Chichele, ill-qualified as he was for the weight of a Crown at such a period, seemed born for the task of promoting the cause of education and religion. His magnificent works at Cambridge and Eton at the present moment attest his devotion, but his patronage of Oxford was also both consistent and wise. Finding Oxford statesmen able and willing to give of their substance for their own University, he applied himself to that which required his aid most, but he also bestowed benefactions on All Souls, Magdalen, and New College, the three fashionable Oxford Colleges of that century.

The Wars of the Roses stopped these great works, and played their part in diminishing the number of

* Anonymous 'History of the University of Oxford,' p. 135, and Wood, *sub anno* 1422.

students. Edward IV. and Henry VII., the children of the strife, had no taste for this sort of expenditure; though they, as well as Richard III., each in turn, visited Oxford in great state, and recognised its importance, and though Henry VII. sent his son Arthur to study at Magdalen, which had become by that time the leading College. In the state apartments of Magdalen (beautifully restored of late years) each of these kings on their visits lodged. Margaret, Countess of Richmond, however, true to her Lancastrian blood, supplied the place of kings, and besides her foundation at Cambridge, her famous Professorships ushered in a new period of life at both Universities.

Still more clearly may National characteristics be traced in the constant struggle which raged upon the question of University jurisdiction. As in so many other cases, the Papal and the National claims over Oxford and Cambridge had never been very clearly defined. The Crown, the Pope, the Archbishop of Canterbury, had each some grounds for maintaining their exclusive rights. Resistance to the Papal claims had been successful so long as a Lollard House of Commons was able to lead the nation, and while the Councils of the West were asserting their supremacy over Popes. But the Councils passed away, and the Popes remained. Again the Roman bulls asserted their authority. Even Chichele, who had once shown much national spirit, was obliged to bend before the storm. If the National Church could not hold out, an effective resistance could scarcely be expected from the Universities. Till the Reformation thundered over the land, Rome kept her own recovered sway in these seats of learning, and the old National rights were lost.

No doubt the Universities had fallen low in the first half of this century, but there is some reason to think that their depression has been exaggerated by those authors from whom most of the history of Oxford is derived. At any rate, it is certain that the Colleges, long before the end of the century, had somehow or other sufficient vigour to receive, first of all European nations except Italy, the Greek literature which the fall of Constantinople had set free, and to educate the men who were to pass it on to the next generation. It does not look like a dead body when it produces at a birth such men as Grocyn, Linacre, Latimer, Tunstall, Colet, Lily, and Sir Thomas More. We have been lately recalled to a grateful memory of some of the 'Oxford Reformers of 1498.'*

If these great men, with the foreign accession of Erasmus, give the impulsive stroke which sets the Universities in motion, Wolsey stands alone in the magnificence of his schemes for their benefit, and the success of his efforts to place them at the head of the National progress. We need not here dwell on the grandeur of his conception, nor stop to endorse the complaint which rises in the minds of most who hear in the Christchurch Bidding Prayer the name of the tyrant copyist substituted for that of the gifted originator.† It is enough for our purpose that we trace once more in the Fellow of Magdalen the influence of Oxford on the Nation,

* By Mr. Seebohm.

† The 'Bidding Prayer,' used by the preacher before a University sermon, is based upon the form given in the 55th Canon, but varies slightly according to the use of different Colleges, and even the will of the preacher himself. Henry VIII. is of course the *legal* founder of Christchurch.

and, in the efforts of himself and his master, the reflex influence of the Nation on the Universities. From this period the Universities date, and have preserved in unbroken succession, the connection of University Professorships and College foundations, the system of *general education along with particular supervision* under which they now flourish. The Collegiate and Tutorial system has indeed been at times, perhaps, till this century, pretty generally, a hard stepmother to the Professoriate, but they have somehow or other worked together. At any rate, from this time, though the Colleges had so far absorbed the students as to have become practically the University, the connection between the Colleges, the uniting link, was to be found at least as much in the Professors as in the Chancellors and the University officers.

That the Universities survived the fall of this magnificent patron, that when the monasteries were swept away they were themselves allowed to stand, has often been a matter of, perhaps somewhat ignorant, surprise. We shall account for it presently. But that the temporary prosperity they had enjoyed under Fox and Wolsey should now be exchanged for a period of decided adversity was to have been expected. The pestilences again played their part. No less than twelve are recorded in the reign of Henry VIII. And the ejection from the Universities of so many of those stiffer spirits which would not bend to every opposite blast, as it blew from the Courts of Henry, Edward VI., and Mary, could not but deteriorate them for a time. Still they suffered with the Nation, supplying the leading combatants on either side—a Cranmer and a Ridley, a Latimer and a Pole. They were still the home and refuge of

learning. It was reserved for Elizabeth to build up the old Universities as she built up the Church and the State.

Few things are more interesting than the accounts which have reached us of Queen Elizabeth's stately visits to Oxford, the meeting of perhaps the best educated, and certainly not the least capable, mind of the age, with those to whom she looked for the renovation of her harassed dominions. Within twelve years of her Accession the marks of past disorders had been obliterated, and the independent privileges of the Universities secured by Act of Parliament. If Leicester made in some respects an indifferent Chancellor, his mistress took good care to govern through him, as she afterwards did through Hatton and Buckhurst. Under the abler management of Burleigh, Parker, and Whitgift, Cambridge, however, for a time took the lead. By means of these Chancellors most of the old abuses were removed at both Universities. The principle of conformity to the now firmly-established Reformed Church of the realm was strictly laid down, and thus an end was put to the fatal interruptions of the work of the place occasioned by religious dissensions. All students were now to sign the Statutes, and be entered on the Matriculation books; and no Degree was to be conferred unless the proper exercises had been performed.

Such as Elizabeth left them have the Universities in all substantial points remained. Connected, chiefly in her reign, with the fast multiplying schools of the country, they no longer professed to be what they had once been, almost the sole educators of the nation, but contented themselves with supplying the highest culture the times could afford to the clergy, the gentry, and a

sprinkling of the middle and lower classes. Protected by the Crown through the revolution that had taken place, they transferred their allegiance, without losing their ancient privileges, from the Pope to the Sovereign. They did indeed but return, like the Nation, to a former position, though to one now no longer disputed. Since that time they have been the strongest bulwarks of Church and Crown.

It has been the fashion to decry the work done by the Universities in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; but it was in reality little, if at all, less glorious than any in their history. The number of learned Divines they produced will scarcely be believed, except by those who have been at the pains to examine the list for themselves; and the gentry they educated were certainly not inferior to any in Europe. The professions of Law and Medicine had, as we have seen, been all but lost before the Reformation. The abstraction of Church preferment at the commencement of that movement did indeed for a moment set University students once more upon the pursuit of the medical profession; but so great was the number of quacks thus thrown upon the public, that in hasty self-defence the London College of Physicians was established. The Universities, though they have never relinquished the attempt, have never since been able to rival that Institution for one of their ancient Faculties, or the Inns of Court for the other. The practical mind of Englishmen preferred men bred at the place where practice could be got. The increased demand for schoolmasters, and the growth of literature as a profession, though slight indeed compared to what they have since become, redressed in some degree the balance. The country acquiesced in what it could not help.

How the first Stuarts identified themselves with the Universities, how Lord Bacon was the glory of Cambridge, how Laud acted over again the part played before him by Wolsey and by Queen Elizabeth, surrounding custom, as we have said, by the framework of law, and giving a still more ecclesiastical tone—perhaps too strictly so—to the University he loved so well; how the Universities repaid the debt when the storm, which their patrons had, it must be admitted, too much share in producing, came; how they shared in the general struggle, and rose with the Nation when the storm had passed; how the Restoration naturally became the period of reward for faithful services—the period of princely benefactions (though not at the hands of the restored kings), of beautifying and perfecting the visible structures which now meet the eye—for a very great part of what is not quite modern is the work of Stuart times—is an oft-told tale, and we shall not repeat it. As the last of the great National Assemblies held at Oxford for purposes either of Church or State was held at this period, 1680, we may, however, sum them up in this place. The list affords some indication of the political importance which the convenient central position of Oxford, and its ancient traditions, combined to create. In Saxon times the Witenagemote met there on, at least, three occasions of sufficient importance to deserve the notice of chroniclers. In Plantagenet and Stuart times, without reckoning the doubtful assembly of Charles I.'s reign, twelve Parliaments have met at Oxford, besides several Conferences and other political gatherings. Fifteen Ecclesiastical Councils have also met there at different periods of our history.

After this time it is enough to refer to their conduct

under James II. to be reminded that the heart of the Nation, when the limbs were paralyzed by the surprise of an unparalleled audacity, still beat high at the Universities, and to point to the way in which Oxford clung to the old dynasty, while Cambridge readily accepted the new, in order to illustrate the conflict of National feeling which they faithfully represented. It is still more to our purpose to remark how the new studies which came in with the later Stuarts found their headquarters at Oxford and Cambridge; how the University which had been far before its age in the persons of Grosseteste and Bacon, was the leader of its generation in the persons of Robert Boyle and the founders of the Royal Society, and thus how Physical Science went forth from its walls winged for its modern conquests; how the study of Mathematics leaped to its full height at Cambridge in the persons of Newton and his peers; how Bentley, at the same University, became the parent of Classical Criticism; how Locke from Oxford set free the Philosophic thought which Germany has so often claimed as her own.

If we follow on the history still later, we observe the same synchronism between the sluggishness of the Nation in the eighteenth century and that of the Universities, the period of moral corruption in Church and State, only broken by the wild war-cry of the French Revolution. But no sooner is the spell broken than with the Nation the Universities also start to life, and from the commencement of this century run their career side by side, urging each other with

> "advancing tread,
> Till, like twin stars, with even pace,
> Each lucid course"

runs abreast of the progress of the age, stimulated by "searching examinations and hard-fought honours," developing the best Tutorial staff in the world, and, by degrees, a working Professoriate, adding to the number of students, embracing larger and larger areas of society,* and firmly fixed in the respect of the nation.† The formation of new Universities leaves them unchanged. It does not affect them. They are still, though capable of further improvement, National.

* The number of matriculations at Oxford and Cambridge is nearly equal, and steadily increasing. Reckoning the average time taken to obtain an Oxford degree at three years and a half, and that taken to obtain a Cambridge degree at a little less, they were each educating about 1800 undergraduates when this lecture was given. The numbers are higher now. The extension of University influence through the "Local Examinations" is matter of notoriety.

† The eighteenth century, says Lord Stanhope, is to the Universities as "a valley between hills, in each of which" (the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries) "one must own their intellectual elevation." "At either of these periods a traveller from London might, as he left the uplands and crossed the Cherwell Bridge, have wandered through the proud array before him of pinnacles and battlements—from where spread the cloisters of Magdalen and the groves that bear Addison's name—to the books and the galleries of the Bodleian, to that unequalled chapel of New College, or to that noble bequest of Wolsey, the wide quadrangle of Christchurch, and all the way have met nothing that misbecame the genius of the place—nothing to clash with the lofty and reverent thoughts which it suggested." After describing what the traveller would have seen in the seventeenth century, he says—"If he had visited Oxford under the fourth George or the fourth William, he would then, amidst some indefensible abuses, have found much, very much, to admire and commend. He would have found most indefatigable tutors, most searching examinations, most hard-fought honours. He would have found on all sides a true and growing zeal for the reputation and wellbeing of the place."—'History of England,' vol. vii. p. 317.

In using the word "National," it is necessary to guard against misconstruction. The brief outline of history given above will afford no countenance to the view that the Universities are the creatures of the State. The existence of a power, lodged somewhere external to the Universities, which could step in upon occasion and redress abuses, has been, indeed, an obvious fact. This power, in matters of civil right, has, of course, been exerted by the State, though even here it is important to observe that the Universities have always had their own special and independent Courts of Law, recognized by the law of the land. But the power to interfere with the proceedings of the Universities has been claimed, as we have seen, by various parties; and in the conflict of claims the Universities found, before the Reformation, a constant argument for maintaining more or less of freedom. At the Reformation itself the direct interference of the Crown was, of course, much more exercised; but the Act of 13 Elizabeth recognized their independence to the fullest extent ever previously known, and since then there have been numerous occasions when that independence has been successfully asserted. It may throw light on the question if we recall some of the more salient instances of such assertion.

The position taken up by the Universities in early times was marked out for them by the feudal institutions of which they formed a part. The right of resistance to the smallest encroachment on the privileges of a privileged person or corporation was, as we know, not only recognized, but a solemn duty. It was the basis of the whole system. Each institution dwelt apart, so to speak, protecting itself, and looking to no one but its feudal superior for aid in so doing. The inbred

Anglo-Saxon devotion to law strengthened the feudal principle of mutual obligations. The Universities, with their dim antiquity and rights gained by custom long before they were theirs by grant, exhibited this indomitable independence more vigorously than any other body. We have referred to their ever-ready method of Secession. Nor were they satisfied with so troublesome a mode of defence alone. They called to their aid the superstition of the times. The cunning of the ecclesiastics had invented what they called the "Curse of St. Frideswide," which would light on the head of any monarch who should dare to sleep at Oxford. Henry III. was the first to brave this curse. Edward I. braved a similar curse at Cambridge.* The spell was thus broken, but the spirit which did not fear to brave the Pope and Legate, which did not hesitate to hold Oxford, and then Northampton, against the forces of a King, was never wanting in expedients; and the exceeding jealousy with which these literary republics unceasingly struggled for their real or supposed rights forms perhaps the main feature in a great portion of their history. Nor do we find the spirit crushed even under the heavy hand of Henry VIII. The resistance of the younger Masters of Arts when their seniors quailed before him is an episode never to be forgotten; while, later on, the sturdy resistance of the whole University to the dominant Puritans, when each College had to be taken possession of, one after another, by military force, and this long after the rest of the nation had submitted, tells the same tale. The resistance to James II., which saved the nation from a French government as well as

* Stow.

from Papal domination, was scarcely stronger, though more famous, at one University than at the other. If Oxford clung to the fallen family, after having done its best to resist its tyranny, with a tenacity which was open to the charge of being sometimes bigoted or over-scrupulous, there was at least something more respectable at bottom than empty bravado. There was a noble affection for a house with whose better deeds the University had been identified; there was a dread of the return of Puritan ascendancy; there was a determination to support the rights of the Church against the chilling hand of Hanoverian statesmanship. Even the solitary charge of subserviency made so maliciously against Oxford by Pope, in the 'Dunciad,' on account of the expulsion of Locke, and repeated by those who ought to have known better, has been amply disproved by Lord Grenville*—Dr. Fell alone being responsible for abetting the tyrannical act of Charles II. as Visitor of Christchurch. So well understood, indeed, was this independent position, that some hold that our kings have never used the language of command in reference to the acts of the University. This can hardly be proved; but even Charles I., who, if any one, might have urged his requests after the manner of a sovereign, was contented, when he wished the honour of a degree to be conferred on an Oxford Bachelor of Arts for a distinguished service, to "write on his behalf."

If, then, we may interpret the relations existing for so many ages between the State and the Universities, they may be summed up thus. Their right to independent self-government was always recognised and re-

* 'Oxford and Locke.'

spected; but when disorders of peculiar virulence occurred, with the causes of which they were unable or unwilling to deal, or when a change of dynasty or a National Reform of religion rendered direct interference absolutely necessary, on such occasions the Crown interfered. If any such interference was plainly contrary to law, the resistance of the Universities was considered by the country to be a duty; and it was generally successful. While, then, the Universities have been National in the sense of being Representative, Privileged, Cared-for, and Used by the Nation, they have also been Independent and Self-governed. As their property was not derived from the State,* but has been the gift of munificent individuals, so the State has not assumed any further control over it than was positively necessary from time to time in order to put a stop to gross abuses. Nothing approaching to the "paternal" treatment of the Continental Universities has been so much as attempted by the State, except on such rare and special occasions as have been mentioned. It was then but temporary, and withdrawn when no longer needed; the wise English mind perceiving clearly enough that the free independent action of great literary corporations was a thing to be preserved by all means, that such a jewel was not to be bought for money, and that they had at least as much right to the free enjoyment of their privileges as other corporations.

These historical relations between the two parties explain a part of the phenomena which have attracted the admiration of the German Professor, but

* The exceptions are quite trifling.

only a part. The connection between the Universities and the Church of England fills up the blank. Oxford and Cambridge have passed through three phases. They have existed as single and simple corporations; as single corporations, with smaller corporations (the colleges) growing up within them; and, if we may use the expression, as compound corporations —*i.e.*, the smaller corporations having become co-extensive and commensurate in the aggregate with the larger ones.* In all phases alike they have been in the eye of the Canon Law, Ecclesiastical—in the eye of the Common Law, Lay Corporations. In all phases alike they have until our own day consisted of Churchmen, and of Churchmen only. This circumstance was provided for, before the Reformation, by the Ecclesiastical Headship of the Pope, the Archbishop, or the Bishop of the diocese, by the condition of the age which placed all education, all learning, and all professions, as a matter of course, in the hands of ecclesiastics; and by the discipline of the united Western Church, which admitted of no dissent. Since the Reformation, it has been provided for by the act of the Universities themselves, under the indirect guidance and sanction of the Crown. Thus the Nation and the Universities have grown up together, accustomed, through whatever changes, to this ecclesiastical aspect of the latter bodies. During the

* Yet to speak of the Colleges, under the modern phase, as being co-extensive with the University is not strictly accurate. The Oxford Halls still represent a non-Collegiate element. It is true they have become very like Colleges, but they are the old Halls still. They have no separate corporate existence. They are fragments of the University. Since this Lecture was delivered both Universities have resolved to try the experiment of "unattached students."

first phase of University existence, the monks and friars, whose establishments were rich and numerous both at Oxford and Cambridge, had powerfully aided in stamping upon them this ecclesiastical character. The Universities were always represented in the Synods of the Church. Laymen were absorbed and lost in the great ecclesiastical body. During the second phase, as we have seen, the two Faculties of Law and Medicine gradually melted away from their old homes, and re-formed themselves in London. Thus, at the very time when the Ecclesiastical body was itself growing weaker, the disappearance of its rivals gave it secure possession. We have seen also that the foundation of the Colleges was synchronous with the National struggle against the monks, and especially against the friars, the Pope's body-guard; as also with the great social disorders of the fourteenth century. Their founders had in view not only the discipline and regular education of students, ill provided for under the older system, but also the provision for Divine Worship throughout the land, the supply of secular clergy, and the substitution of such National clergy, trained in accordance with their statutes, for the monks and friars who swarmed over the country and were more or less anti-national. The kings and statesmen who founded Colleges were the men of all others to see the need of this substitution. The statutes of many Colleges bear witness to this feeling, and it is probably implied in other cases where it is not expressed. A few instances will suffice.

The objects of the great founder of the Collegiate System, Walter de Merton, have been thus happily summed up by Bishop Hobhouse, in his Sketch of the

Life of that great man.* "His conception was that of an incorporated body of secular students, endowed with all the attributes of the great corporations of Regulars—self-support, self-government, self-replenishment,—settled locally in connection with a great seat of study, acquiring a share of that influence in the University which the establishment of powerful monasteries within its bounds had almost monopolised in the hands of the Regulars, and wielding that influence for the benefit of the Church in the advancement of the Secular clergy, who, for lack of support and encouragement in the Universities, were sadly decayed in learning." "He forbade his scholars even to take vows." "They were to keep themselves free from every other institution." (His words are, that they should forfeit their scholarships "si quis eorum religionem intraverit," "si religionis habitum assumant." †) "He looked forward to their going forth to labour *in sæculo*, and acquiring preferment and property. Study being the function of the inmates of his house, their time was not to be taken up by ritual or ceremonial duties, for which special chaplains were appointed; neither was it to be bestowed on any handicrafts, as in some monastic orders. Voluntary poverty was not enjoined, though poor circumstances were a qualification for a fellowship. No austerity was required, though contentment with simple fare was enforced as a duty." "The proofs of the founder's

* 'Sketch of the Life of Walter de Merton,' &c. By Edmund, Bishop of Nelson, New Zealand, late Fellow of Merton College, D.D. (Parkers.)

† 'Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford.' Printed by desire of H. M. Commissioners for inquiring into the state of the University of Oxford. (Parker and Longmans, 1853.) Merton Coll., pp. 6, 11, 27.

design to benefit the Church through a better-educated secular priesthood are to be found, not in the letter of the Statutes, but in the tenor of their provisions, especially as to studies, in the direct averments of some of the subsidiary documents, in the fact of his providing Church patronage as part of his system, and in the readiness of prelates and chapters to grant him impropriations of the rectorial endowments of the Church." "The Statutes, like many a document set forth by a man thoroughly possessed with a leading idea, never expressly set forth that idea." "'In honorem Divini nominis, in profectionem ecclesiæ, pro utilitate ecclesiastici regiminis,' are the wide phrases conveying his general purpose, which is much more closely described by their patrons in their grants and confirmations." "Clearly his main end was the benefiting the Church by erecting a nursery for her parochial priesthood in the bosom of the University, a band (not of 'religiosi studiose viventes,' but) of 'studiosi, religiose viventes.'" * Merton, it is well known, was the model for all. In Oriel we find the same idea, "the increase of Divine Worship." Its scholars must study Theology, and of these three *might* study Canon Law. The Statutes of Queen's use the same words, "increase of Divine Worship."

The great head of the next series of founders, William of Wykeham, remarks that he had convinced himself, after a most careful study of the rules of the old religious institutions, that they had been grievously ill-kept, and if wise and provident statutes could secure the permanency of his own, he certainly deserved to succeed.

* See also 'Arms of the Oxford Colleges,' with Notes and Illustrations by the Rev. J. W. Burgon.

He assigns in his Charter of 1379, says Ayliffe,* "the paucity of the secular clergy here in England to be the chief cause of this charity of his, forbidding his fellows to enter into religious houses." Lincoln is especially founded for a theological purpose, the defence of the faith against heretics. The Patent Roll of Henry VI. grants Archbishop Chichele's prayer for a charter to All Souls on the ground of the desire to "increase the clergy of our kingdom;" and we find a reference to "the impoverished condition of the clergy of our kingdom, which is daily becoming more conspicuous." The expressions about Magdalen are of the same character. It is founded for the "extirpation of heresies and errors, the increase of the clergy, and the honour of Holy Mother Church;" "the support and exaltation of the Church, and the increase of Divine Worship;" and, again, "for the honour of God and the increase of the clergy and of Divine Worship." The Letters Patent of Brasenose indulge in a flight of poetry, and remark that "as flowers and fruits are nourished from roots of trees, so each and all who desire to study Sacred Theology derive their excellence from the faculties of the sciences, sophistry, logic, and philosophy;" and Sir Richard Sutton declares the foundation to be for "the support and exaltation of the Christian faith, the profit of Holy Church, and the increase of Divine Worship." Bishop Fox is less direct. He compares Corpus to a beehive, where his students "shall day and night make wax and sweet honey for the honour of God and the ease of all Christians." Wolsey declares his one reason for founding Cardinal College was his perceiving the necessity of training youth "as well in moral cha-

* I. 113.

racter as in literature, that they might commend and confirm the faith of Christ their Saviour in simple minds not less by the example of their life, than by the true and sincere preaching of the gospel." The entirely ecclesiastical character of his magnificent foundation was acknowledged without reservation in the completion of the work by Henry VIII. St. John's is founded for "the increase of the Christian faith;" Jesus, for "the amplification and establishment of the Christian faith and sincere religion, for the extirpation of errors and false opinions, and for the increased and continued cultivation of piety, . . . for the common usefulness and felicity of Christ's Church and Kingdom, and our subjects." In Pembroke all fellows and scholars were bound by the statutes to study theology, and to take priest's orders.*

In short, in all alike, while the assistance of "pauperes et indigentes scholares" is especially recognised, while the notion of study, the studies being specified according to the mode of the time, is carefully put forth, while a rule of life is a part of each scheme, the religious element is more or less definitely opposed to the so-called "religious life" of the day, that of the monasteries and religious houses. *To them they are in fact rival institutions, peculiarly English and National, as opposed to what was Foreign and Papal.* They are designed to produce the sort of character drawn once and for ever by the founder of English poetry, "The Clerk of Oxenfoorde," and the "Poure Persone of a Toun." They did produce it. The Colleges, eleemosynary foundations as they all were, opened the door for a cer-

* See 'Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford' *passim* for these quotations and summaries.

tain number of youths of the lower classes to come to the Universities, and be carefully trained for the good of the Church and Nation; and as the need of systematic provision for the clergy of the land became more and more pressing, the duty of teaching as well as studying, a duty little recognized in the earliest foundations, became more and more recognized.

Lastly, we have the most complete proof of the distinction between the ecclesiastical function which the Colleges were meant to discharge, and that of the Monastic institutions, in their different fate at the Reformation. While every one of the latter bodies at the Universities was swept away, such as at Oxford, Durham, and St. Bernard's Colleges, Canterbury and Gloucester Halls, those which retained even the strongest mediæval character, such as All Souls, where the services for the faithful departed formed a leading element, but which had no bond of connection with the "Religious Houses," were suffered to remain. In short, the connection between the Colleges and the secular clergy, the fixed clergy of towns and villages, is as marked in the later middle ages as it has been since.

These facts are all-important in the history of the Reformation. At that epoch the Colleges, which were already almost identical with the Universities, favoured, or but slightly opposed, the overthrow of that which they were long before founded in order to supersede, the Monastic system; and that carried with it the Papal system. The keen-sighted Tudors saw the need of retaining and using them for establishing the Reformation. These monarchs resisted the strongest efforts made for their suppression; hence they passed by a natural process, with wonderfully little change, into the

Universities of the Reformed Church of England. The Church of the Nation had reformed itself. It was still the Church of England, the Church of the Nation. The Universities marched along with the Church. They were still the Universities of the Church, the Universities of the Nation. "In most instances," says Mr. Goldwin Smith, "there is nothing to show that the founders of Roman Catholic Colleges would not have changed with the main body of the Church of England at the Reformation. Too much stress has probably been laid on this connection."*

We need not trace with any minuteness the Post-Reformation connection between the Universities and the Church of England. That is well known in its length and breadth. The history of the Church is in this country the history of the State in most respects, and the Universities shared the fortunes of both. Nurses of the heroes who fought the battle of Church and State against Romanism and Puritanism, they supplied, with scarcely an exception, every man amongst that galaxy of Stuart Divines with which we are all familiar. When, in Hanoverian times, the Church staggered under the onslaught of her enemies, it was the University men who fought for her to the last. Through these champions Convocation gave its last utterances in the days of the first George. Even in the evil times which succeeded the suppression of the Church's voice, a Bishop Butler was raised up to illuminate the gloom of Theology, a Wesley to relight the lamp of Christian zeal, a Dr. Johnson to lead the way in the reformation of letters, a Blackstone to lay anew, in a noble, religious spirit, the foundations of law. The knowledge of Theo-

* Statement appended to University Commissioners' Report.

logy, Classical literature, the exact sciences, and mental philosophy, was at least kept alive in the English bivalved heart during the general chill of the English dark age.

When the Universities once more awoke with the Nation, their vitality instantly reacted on the Church. From them issue the awakening notes which are echoed from every town and village in the realm. The Nation recognises their value as religious and moral agents. Men attempt to found similar institutions, but find it as hard as to create from political chaos spick-and-span English Constitutions, and for the same reason,—these things have not been made. They have grown. They have become what they are through a course of ages, a piece of mechanism of far too delicate a nature to be rudely handled.

We have thus marked off the four great historical aspects of the English Universities. We have traced their NATIONALITY politically and socially, their COLLEGIATE CHARACTER, their INDEPENDENCE, and their IDENTIFICATION WITH THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. We recur to Dr. Döllinger's statement, and we put the two together. That our system should, as he says, "make instruction take root in the mind, and become a part of it, and that the influence of our training should extend beyond the mere communication of knowledge to the ennobling elevation of the life and character," is the simple result of the above-mentioned facts. The people have had confidence in a system which was protected by the State, while allowed to retain its independence; which protected the character of students at the most impressible age; and which was identified with the Church. The Uni-

versities, in other words, have established a character of their own in the course of ages, and the Professor has drawn it for us.

Does the sketch of University history here given strike any one as of little use in accounting for the phenomena of our existing institutions, and their position with regard to the nation? Let him, if he is a University man, reflect on the extraordinary influence the past had on the bearings of the commonest circumstances which encompassed his University life. Let him remember how impossible it is to get to the bottom of any question, still more such a complex one as this, without giving full attention to its history. In the old English Universities a man is reminded of the past at every turn of his life. To say nothing of the hallowed memorials of predecessors and benefactors all around, the quaint forms which have in reality so much meaning, and the antique customs which still excite so much interest, we can only understand such phenomena as, for example, the obstinately recurring town-and-gown rows, unmeaning as they now seem, when we remember the traditions of real, constant, and sanguinary conflict of which University annals are full. We cease to wonder at the extraordinary persistence of Bacchanalian Commemorations when we reflect on the ancient institution of the privileged jesters, the Terræ Filii,* who, year after year, for so long a series, were allowed, on these occasions, amidst the shouts of their compeers, to lampoon the gravest dignitaries of the University. We are

* Of these Terræ Filii a very interesting account has appeared in 'Macmillan's Magazine' for January, 1868.

less astonished at the remarkable tendency which our educational system shows, whatever changes may have been introduced into it, to recur to ancient types, when we reckon up the main facts of its marvellous history.

Perhaps we may conclude this Lecture by a word or two in reference to the German Professor's general criticism of the old Universities, contained in his interesting pamphlet. If the process of improvement be still going on too slowly to satisfy the ardour of our critics—if it is alleged (with much exaggeration) that they are still only big boys' schools, have no "learned class," and do but little in return for their noble revenues,—candid observers will allow that the improvements, even of the last very few years, have been neither few nor unimportant,—that these improvements have not yet had sufficient time to develop themselves,—that the men trained under the new system have not yet found their full employment, —that bodies which have confessedly preserved a valuable system, lost or never possessed by other nations, may be pardoned if they have still something to learn from those which have made a wholly different system their all in all,—that the effort to combine both systems (the Collegiate and Tutorial, with the Professorial) has already made some progress, and is in a fair way of making more,—that if so many great books are not written at our English Universities as in Germany, the men who write our best books have at least received their training at these institutions,—that our boast of making men rather than books is not an unworthy theory of education,—and that, the German States having hitherto been small and despotically governed, the terms of comparison do not in reality

apply, since the openings for educated men in public life have not been, and cannot be, what they are in a self-governed country like England, while the activity of the first of commercial and colonising States supplies employment for youth which is not found in Germany. It must also be admitted, further, that English ideas revolt at the notion of State-governed and State-nursed Universities—that laws which insist on public servants, or members of the liberal professions, being educated in one particular way, as in Germany,* and that alone, would never find favour in our freer soil—that the number of educated men amongst our clergy and gentry is, after all, very far greater than in Germany—that the extension of the Universities to all classes of our community has already commenced with vigour; and, finally, that the deeply ingrained principle with Englishmen, that religion should form part of all education, at all its stages, has made them insist on placing their sons where clergymen take at least the leading part, and where that ecclesiastical character which, as we have seen, has attracted men to the Universities from their earliest foundation down to our own times, is still retained.

The revolutions of ages may have rendered it impossible to keep to the minutest points of the wills of founders, and to some even of the leading purposes they had in view. The mere education of young men for a short period may have become far more the business of the Colleges than was contemplated in the earlier foundations; but the reconstruction of Collegiate buildings

* See Dr. Perry's Evidence in the 'Special Report, &c.,' of the Committee of the House of Commons on Mr. Ewart's University Extension Bill.

on their present scale, which has been going on for several centuries, proves to demonstration that this change has long been accepted and approved. At any rate, the common sense of Englishmen has taught them the pedantry of destroying or injuring vast agencies for good, because they are doing that good in a way which was not exactly intended or foreseen, but which the course of ages has developed, and the desirableness of rather devoting themselves to the recovery, in a manner suited to the age, of any of the old uses which have been suffered to pass away, and which may yet be worthy of resuscitation. Englishmen are not willing to break with the past, when the history of that past is such as we have described it. Like the mutual compensation afforded by the different temperatures of the sea and land, the English Universities and the Nation have exchanged with each other the hot and cold breezes which were necessary in order to keep up the equilibrium of a healthy atmosphere. If one was behind the age, the other may have temporarily fallen with it, but had a reserve force within which gave the impulse to fresher gales; if one was too far in advance of the medium, the calmer and cooler influence of the other before long restored the balance. Men hesitate to part with what has thus become a sort of second nature.

At any rate, if some of our neighbours despise the old Universities a little too much, some of our own keen-sighted progeny take a very different view. There is no English institution which the Americans so much admire. Mr. Everett has lately told us what an American thinks about Cambridge.* To be sure, Oxford fares differently at his hands; but as he confesses his

* 'On the Cam.'

entire ignorance of it, that need not disturb the peace of Oxford men. Not long since, however, the lecturer had the honour of meeting an American judge, sent over to England on a diplomatic mission by the President of the United States—a man of ripe experience, wisdom, and high cultivation. He said something of this sort: "Don't you believe, sir, what the American newspapers say about England. They do not represent our people. Americans have the deepest reverence for your institutions, and especially for Oxford. They look upon it as the property of the race. They would deplore the touch which injured it. Keep your Oxford, sir—the Oxford which we know. Remove all abuses, if there are any, but beware how you allow it to be revolutionized to suit the theories of modern experiment-makers."

LECTURE VII.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE RELIGIOUS AND THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

NOVEMBER 7, 1868.

IN some former Lectures we attempted to trace the relations of Church and State through successive periods of English history* with reference to the question, how far the essential Freedom of the Church had been retained in the midst of political changes. We return to the subject under another aspect. Let us inquire what position the Church of England has held in direct relation to British politics; noticing also, as far as their religious influence has affected politics, the opponents of the Church. The English have sometimes been represented as an irreligious people. It would be difficult to repel the accusation on many points which could be alleged. But hostile critics are apt to regard too much the external aspect of a people who take a delight in making the worst of themselves, and thus are led to disregard the real condition of the heart of the nation. In no country has the connection of Religion with Poli-

* It has been impossible to avoid a certain amount of repetition in running over the same ground, though with a different object: but it is hoped that this will be found to have been reduced to the narrowest limits.

tics been stronger or more continuous;* and while we have an instinctive repugnance to many of the circumstances which degrade this connection, the unreality, factiousness, intrigue and turbulence which confront us at every step, it can hardly be denied that for a whole people, from generation to generation, to make religious questions the centre round which their National struggles are grouped, betokens an earnestness of belief which should at least protect them from this reproach. It is the steady undercurrent which marks the character. The troubled waves are accidental and superficial. Other countries have had more religious wars. England, saved from war at the Reformation by the vigorous government of the Tudors, has had but one, "the Great Rebellion." Our struggle has taken the form of a Party warfare. In that Party warfare the question of Religion has almost always been paramount, though not always equally observable.

As this fundamental connection has not been fully developed by the standard authors to whom we should naturally look,† it may not be useless to pursue the traces of it as a clue through our national history, confining our attention to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with only a word or two of remark upon the previous period.

* "With us religion has been a power, and has often generated that spirit of self-sacrifice which must take the lead more or less in all great changes."—Vaughan's 'Revolutions of History,' iii. 597.

† To mention only a few, we cannot expect a proper treatment of this subject from Hallam, who does not attempt to conceal that he is a Whig partisan; from Macaulay, whose sympathies are in the same direction, though he is more fair than Hallam; or from Guizot, as a French Protestant. For the later portion, on the other hand, Lord Stanhope's 'History' gives us the most valuable assistance.

The Reformation must always be considered the grand central event which separates the history of England after the Conquest into two parts. But the political and Constitutional history of England rather requires a triple division; from the Conquest to Richard II.; from Richard II. to Charles I.; and from thence down to our own day: or we may divide it (a little more roughly) under different dynasties. The Normans and hereditary Plantagenets cover the first; the Lancastrian, Yorkist, and Tudor princes the second; the Stuarts and Hanoverians the third. Wicliff divides the second from the first; Laud, or the two first Stuarts, the third from the second.

In that First Period we must look for the connection between Religion and Politics, not so much in the government of the State by great ecclesiastics, as in the struggle of kings and nobles, supported by the Anglo-Saxon traditions of the class below, against the ecclesiastical system introduced with the Conquest and centred at Rome. "*Clericis laicos infestos*," as the bull of Pope Boniface VIII. had it, was true enough, but it was a general, a National hostility to the political system of Rome and the growing corruptions of her venal Courts. The civil and foreign wars, the popular and parliamentary struggles of the period may be largely traced to this cause. The doctrines of the Church were little questioned, and certainly, till the time of Wicliff, did not affect politics. But the latter part of the fourteenth century witnessed a great religious change. The translation of the Bible and the rapid growth of the Pre-Reformation marshalled nearly half the people in opposition to Roman doctrine. Hence a change in the direction of politics, a change which received an

enormous impulse when the fifteenth century ushered in the horrible spectacle of so-called heretics tortured at the stake for their religious opinions. Hitherto the nation as a whole had exhibited its merely political antagonism to Rome. Now, joined with the doctrinal rebellion, comes the rude organization of political parties within the State, banded together upon distinct religious principles.

In our Second Period we find, then, a sturdy spirit of resistance to the arbitrary power both of Crown and clergy very frequently exhibited in the House of Commons. We trace it all through the troubled reigns of Richard II. and the three Lancastrian monarchs. The religious element in this resistance is intimately connected with the political progress of the age, the French war and the struggles of statesmen. Merged for a moment in the War of the Roses, though we may trace even in that obscure period something of a political bond formed by religious opinion, heard but in faint mutterings while the iron hand of the first Tudor reorganized the civil policy of the realm, the outburst of the Continental Reformation, itself the child of the English movement, found the Religious character of English Politics largely developed. The religious mind of the country was now fully prepared and eagerly anxious to join in the mighty struggle. It had become an affair of State. But the century and more which had elapsed since Wicliff's death had given men time to think out the subject. It was no hasty, crazy change in England. Two parties had gradually developed amongst the Reformers, at first united; and here lay the germs of all that has characterized English history in modern times. Two main streams of unequal size parted off at last from the

Roman obedience. By far the largest and most important cherished the ancient English feeling of devotion to the National Church, but to that Church as independent of Rome, accepting the reform of her doctrinal and practical errors without relinquishing the slightest hold of, rather vigorously reasserting, Primitive Truth and Order. Led by the Sovereign, the peerage, the gentry and the more enlightened of the clergy, this party may almost be called the Nation; for, as the Reformed Church became settled and established under Elizabeth, these men gathered strength from every quarter, and for a time formed the one visible representation of the Reformation. Nor only so. The Reformation, as we have received it, the Prayer-book which contains it, is theirs; theirs were the Convocation and the Parliament which prepared and ratified our authoritative documents.

But side by side with this party, often apparently absorbed in it, ran, during the sixteenth century, the much thinner stream of the descendants of the Lollards, the more violent Reformers, whose zeal took the impress of fanaticism, and whose notion of right in matters of religion may not unfairly be described as an attempt to reach the point farthest removed from Rome. Sullenly bending to the strength of the greater body, this party lay by and waited its opportunity. As the strong arm of Henry VIII. grew weak it took courage from the more pronounced reformers of the Continent, flamed in the furious van of iconoclasm with Protector Somerset, lent a large proportion to the roll of martyrs under Mary, and claimed to be represented as a party in the House of Commons before Elizabeth vacated her throne.

The Puritans of the seventeenth century were only a more powerful and outspoken body than their predecessors of the sixteenth; they were the same people. They had hitherto worked in comparative obscurity, more felt than perceived by the governing classes, and giving a tone to the movement more marked than their numbers or importance justified. For in fact they knew what they meant, and their energy often prevailed where more moderate counsels were at fault. Could James I., had he been as wise as he was the contrary, have absorbed this growing party? Probably not. Doubtless his measures accelerated its rise to power, but they were very far from causing its existence.

Our Third Period opens with the emergence of this party into a leading position. The country gentlemen threw their weight into its scale. From henceforth we trace the political division of the Nation into two distinct bodies. The modern names were as yet unknown, but they were subsequently imposed on what had existed from the commencement of the Stuart era. The mischievous policy of the first Stuarts, in raising the Church to a political position it had no right to occupy, alienated all its best friends. The clergy brought certain ruin on their order by accepting the position which Laud had made for them. The most moderate men began to perceive that the demand for civil and religious liberty was now sacred and legitimate. For a time the nation was led by its natural leaders in the path of resistance to the Church and Crown. And so, owing to the follies of their opponents, the Puritans gradually worked their way to a temporary supremacy. The times demanded great changes, and, above all, a man of genius to make them. But the statesmen,

as it happened, and, finally, the man of genius, appeared on the Puritan side; the absolute government of their fellow-countrymen fell into their hands. Then, splitting into sections,—forced, by the disgust of the great mass of the people at their proceedings, from a position which was in reality but accidental,—they sank back again more speedily than they rose. No longer pretending to influence the Church from within, the beaten faction formed a separate camp. The Nonconformists were to subside into the humbler position of a single element of one of the two great parties which have governed England by the process of mutual antagonism from the time of Charles II. to our own day. The Great Rebellion, the Restoration, the intervening period between that and the Revolution, the Revolution itself, and the Party struggles which have succeeded it, —all alike bear witness to the religious character of the influences which have determined English politics, and all alike display the presence of that divided stream in which the waters of the Reformation flowed.

The great Civil War, or "Great Rebellion," we are all now learning to regard in its religious aspect. The time has passed when political writers could treat it as a mere revolt against the illegal proceedings of the Sovereign. We are returning to the truer view, which indeed we can hardly help gathering from the contemporary writers, the view which discovers the causes of that movement in the deep springs of traditional religious thought, and accounts for its phenomena quite as much by the love or hatred of the Church of England as by the mistakes of Charles and the genius of Cromwell. It is unnecessary to dwell further on this point.

The Restoration saw the triumph of the Church of England at full tide, and its opponents sunk so low as to be utterly useless for several years in balancing the party which now represented pretty nearly the whole Nation. Of the leading principle of the Royalists Hallam speaks thus, and his admission is important: "The Church of England, distinctly and exclusively, was their rallying point; the Crown itself stood only second in their affections."* There can be no doubt on this point. If we required any proof that the bitter struggle of the previous twenty years had been rather religious than political we should find it here. It was round the old National Church, as the Reformation had left it in Elizabeth's reign, that the whole political machinery of England revolved; and thus, when parties and party-government began to take definite shape, when the follies of Churchmen had again sufficiently compacted a new opposition out of the wrecks of the old, it was thus that the meaning of the cries on one side was—"The Church shall be kept National;" on the other, under different euphemisms—"Down with the Nationality of the Church."

The names of Whig and Tory are not heard till the latter part of Charles II.'s reign. They are the opprobrious nicknames, borrowed from the most contemptible sources, which the bitterness of the conflict upon the Exclusion Bill put into men's mouths. But what was the occasion which thus left its mark upon English history? It was a great Religious question, the turning-point of the Politics of Englishmen. Should the country be handed over once more, through the blind zeal of a too loyal party, to the Papal faction? Had the powerful

* 'Constitutional History of England,' chap. xi.

Church party used its opportunities with the sagacity and straightforwardness which seldom flourish in times of prosperity, it would not have given such an opening to its assailants. It had forgotten that on one point the nation was quite resolved. If it insisted on having back its old Church, it was still more determined that it would not have a return to Romanism. If the two things were to be confused, it had no difficulty in making up its mind. It would accept the Nonconformists rather than the Pope. What had blinded and for a moment ruined the Church party? We have said, in one word—prosperity. Let us pursue the analysis a little further.

The clergy of the Church having been restored, with too little consideration for the ejected intruders, its Prayer-book and Rubrics resettled, with, perhaps, too little attempt to conciliate in non-essentials; the Corporation Act ensuring a political power for the Church, necessary, perhaps, for the times, but which assuredly carried as much danger as protection; the Conventicle and Five Mile Acts forced upon a prostrate party almost like a badge of slavery, the better sense of Churchmen had become obscured. The Test Act put the seal, as they fondly believed, on their perfect security. As the Corporation Act had protected the Church from the Dissenters, so did the Test Act from the Papists.* Churchmen learned to accept, without much inquiry, the doctrines only two generations old, the doctrines unknown to the better days of English history, the slavish doctrines of Passive Obedience and the Divine Right of Kings. Brought into existence, at least in a

* The Dissenters supported the latter. 'Const. Hist.' chap. xi.

definite form, by James I. and his courtly divines to cover the defect of Parliamentary title under which he conceived himself to labour,* these doctrines had become sentimentally dear to the Royalists, and especially to the clergy, who connected them with the sufferings of their martyr-King. They were now accepted, by a sort of unsifted claim of natural right, as a creed. Was not this, they said, the true justification of all the acts of the Restoration? The ruler by Divine right, and the sacred body which was the guardian of that right, had been eclipsed together, and they must rise together and rule. Thus the ill-disguised Romanist tendencies of the one royal brother and the avowed Romanism of the other were tolerated; thus the disgrace of their monarch's becoming a pensioner of the French King was winked at; thus no efficient resistance was made to the multitude of arbitrary acts by which Charles and his Cabinet shamefully and ungenerously tried the patience of a too confiding people.

The series of Plots which disgraced this reign were so many indications of the extent to which the period of the Commonwealth had left its mark on the nation. A people nervously timid from the memories of the past, and without the least confidence in its rulers, rushed from one extreme of violence to another with headlong rapidity. Parties had not yet sufficiently formed to control the executive with effect. The path between insurrection and servile obedience had not yet been marked out. But from the midst of this melancholy struggle, this sad series of judicial murders, perjuries and intrigues, started forth that beneficent system of Party-

* Lord Dartmouth in 'Burnet's History of his Own Time.' Book iii. Oxford Edition.

government for which England had so long been preparing. It was to take the place of alternate tyranny and revolt, of civil war and cruel proscription. Each side began to shape out a distinct policy. The attempt to govern without Parliaments, to subsist upon foreign bribes and to trade upon the affection of the nation, had called up once more the remnants of that powerful faction which had long since appropriated, though when in power they could not put in practice, the watchwords of Civil and Religious Freedom. The Church party had brought it on themselves. They were again to sink for a time from the dimensions of almost the whole nation to that of a party; powerful indeed, but only a party. Among their opponents were, it is true, included a large proportion of Churchmen, but they were Churchmen who rejected most of what had hitherto been considered the characteristics of the Church, and who scrupled not to make common cause with the Nonconformists. Thus were taken up into the political party to which they have ever since belonged, the men who composed that smaller stream of the Reformation which we have already watched in progress.

The enormous vantage-ground yielded by their opponents, gave this party for the moment the ear of the nation. The doctrine of Passive Obedience completely broke down under the strain. Never was the country nearer to a civil war without actually fighting. "The Exclusion Bill," says Hallam,* "was the rock on which English liberty was nearly shipwrecked." Burnet believes in the imminence of an armed conflict. The Parliament of a week at Oxford was almost as near a "mad Parliament" in arms as its predecessor of four

* 'Const. Hist.' chap. xii.

centuries before. "The war," says Bolingbroke, "would have been of uncertain event; the best cause would have been the worst supported; the King, united with his brother, would have prevailed. The religion and liberty of Great Britain would have been destroyed." *

To Lord Shaftesbury was due,—and whatever his motives and his faults, we must give him the credit of being a benefactor to his country for it,—this formation of the great Whig party, the party of resistance to the headlong course of the restored Stuarts. To Lord Danby was due, at this crisis, the policy of "rallying the Cavaliers and the clergy round the Throne, by identifying the cause of the Church with that of the Court." † He thus formed into a compact party the scattered elements of what had not long before been supreme, but which had been necessarily broken up by the circumstances which we have noticed. These, however little they are generally recognized as such, are the true fathers of party-government in England. Their names should never be forgotten. The instruments were not of the finest temper. Probably neither of them understood the importance of what they were doing. They cannot claim the laurels reserved for the less blameable of our Constitutional benefactors, but they at least cut the Gordian knot; they commenced the system under which alone a free and educated people can exist in happiness and security; they commenced it, not for England alone, but for the civilized world. Where shall we place a limit to the work which they began?

But the success of the Whigs had been too sudden and

* 'Dissertation on Parties,' Works, ii. 84.

† Lingard, vol. ix. c. 4. Burnet, folio, p. 248.

rapid for permanence in the then state of the country. The various Plots for which the times were infamous exploded at last in that which sent Russell and Sidney to the scaffold, and banished Shaftesbury for ever. The danger to which the King had been subjected awoke the whole slumbering loyalty of the nation. The danger of a return to the old dreaded despotism of anti-Churchmen terrified the people. The no-Popery cry of the Whigs, righteous as it was at bottom, had been wholly discredited by the exposure of the Plots. Clergy and lawyers, town and country, peer and peasant, joined alike in one great burst of Tory feeling. "The Whigs," says Hallam, "so late in the heyday of their pride, lay, like the fallen angels, prostrate upon the fiery lake." * The shocking state of our Law Courts presented only too great facilities for revenge; and the last years of Charles II.'s reign displayed a very general acceptance of the same absolute principles which ushered it in.

The cessation of Convocation must be regarded as one, and perhaps a very potent reason for this failure of Churchmen to act with wisdom and moderation. A vent for these alarms and suspicions was required. Discussion might have done much to reclaim men from headlong courses; the denunciations in which the country clergy indulged would have stirred up less intemperate zeal; the extreme danger into which that zeal was leading the Church might have been exposed. But no effort was made in this reign to place the clergy in the position they were entitled to occupy in the restored polity, and all parties acquiesced in the neglect. The King was delighted to be saved trouble. The clergy were satisfied with protection, and thankful to be

* 'Const. Hist.,' chap. xii.

relieved of the inconvenient privilege of self-taxation—a necessary change, but fatal to the existing relations of Church and State * without some readjustment, which was never made. But how can we wonder at the neglect of the Clerical Parliament, when the Civil Parliament, as well as the King, were pensioned by France, and when the policy of the Court was a mere trick of playing upon the loyalty of Churchmen, while, under pretence of a zeal for Toleration, the King was advancing steadily towards his goal, the free establishment of Romanism?

But the age, though superficially corrupt and irreligious, was less so at bottom than is sometimes thought. Perhaps it might really be called a religious age with an irreligious varnish. The middle and lower classes were not so much infected as the upper. Religion made itself felt at the crises of politics in a way which often entirely disconcerted the schemes of those who imagined they were pulling the strings. Shall we be told that this was a mere political religion? No doubt it was so to a certain extent. But this was nothing new. Truly regarded, that age had succeeded to one of political religion, though disguised under high-flown sentiment and Scriptural phrases. In other words, Religion and Politics were united. The country cared more about its religion than anything else; and, what is to our present purpose, it was under this aspect that the latest development of our Constitution, the existing phase of it, took place.

The trial that was to test the strength of the National allegiance to the Church was now at hand. James II., at his accession, found the Church party completely in the ascendant, its doctrines scarcely disputed, its

* See the former Lecture, p. 146.

recently-gained popularity still fresh. It would stand by the King, Papist as he was, as it had stood by his brother, if he only gave his word that he would not disturb the settlement of the Church. Happily for England, but in an evil hour for himself, misunderstanding this loyalty, he broke his word and almost at once showed his true colours. Even the success of his arms against rebellion could only beckon back the old feeling for a moment. The Church, as soon as it was sure it was betrayed, definitely pronounced against him; while the Dissenters, despairing of any legitimate victory, grasped at the shadow treacherously offered them in order to cover the introduction of Popery, meanly forgot their late cry, and abetted the crooked policy of the infatuated monarch. But the heart of the Nation was with the Church. Rising in its might, it recognized the Bishops and the Universities as its natural exponents. Under their leadership it conquered. Whig nobles were but its tools. Never was a great political issue more definitely and unmistakably mixed up with a religious question. But no other forms of religion were heard of in the struggle besides the Church of England on one side and Romanism on the other. When the issue was seriously joined, the Dissenters had too much patriotism and too much Protestantism to hold back. They knew well enough what was England's barrier against Rome. From this time, however, must be dated that alliance between Romanism and Dissent, that alliance of extremes against the mean, which the Whig party has so constantly fostered.

Both political parties were alike concerned in the Revolution, though the motives which swayed them were dissimilar. The Tories chiefly regarded the safety

of the nation in its Church aspect, and threw to the winds the unfortunate doctrines which had given such a handle to their Kings. The Whigs chiefly regarded the civil liberties of the people, and discarded that misplaced zeal for Toleration which they saw could be so easily turned into an engine of oppression. "Though the King," says a great writer, "was not the better for his experience, Parties were. Both saw their errors. The Tories stopped short in pursuit of a bad principle. The Whigs reformed the abuse of a good one. Both had sacrificed their country to their party. Both sacrificed on this occasion their party to their country. The Revolution was a fire which purged off the dross of both parties; and, the dross being purged off, they appeared to be of the same metal and answered the same standard." In short, the difficulties attending the change from the mediæval to the modern form of the Constitution had at last found a solution. It had taken a century to produce it. Tyranny, civil and ecclesiastical, had been followed by revolt. A worse tyranny, civil and ecclesiastical, had succeeded the old. The sick nation turning, like Florence, as described by the poet, from side to side, and finding the disease had laid too great a hold to be expelled, learnt to be content with balancing one set of evils against the other. The first grating friction of the new machinery having worn off by use, and the violent jerk of the Revolution having been safely surmounted, it was found that the permanent remedy lay in the perfecting of the temporary expedient, and the good sense of the country gradually developed the system under which we live. But it is plain that this great landmark of Constitutional progress, the Revolution, is far more the token of

a religious than a political high tide. Hallam indeed warns us against too narrowly regarding that event "as grounded upon the danger of the Anglican Church from the bigotry of a hostile religion,"* and he lays much stress on the fact that the leaders of the Revolution in its "final result" were mostly Whigs.† But what could the Whigs have done had not the Nation been at their back? We have seen pretty clearly what was the temper of the nation. But we need not hesitate to follow him when he says, that the Revolution was more entitled to honour for having secured our religious than our civil liberty.‡ Yes, no doubt. Very little did the people at large understand about the Constitutional questions with which the Whigs were identified. What they did understand, as proved by the whole previous and subsequent course of events, and what carried the Revolution, was the deliverance of England from "Popery and wooden shoes," from Roman and French dictation. This was the fundamental English instinct. All else was accidental and superficial.

The Religious character of this great Political change is, as we have said, easily traceable in the acts which accompanied and followed the Revolution. The Bill of Rights laid down the all-important principle that our Sovereign can never himself be, nor can he marry, a Papist. The new form of the Coronation Oath stereotyped the Sovereign's connection with the Church of England. The Toleration Act solved the long-vexed

* 'Const. Hist.,' chap. xv.

† Ibid., chap. xiv. For the really popular character of the Revolution, as distinguished from the work of the aristocratic agents, see 'Vaughan's Revolutions of History,' iii. 566.

‡ 'Const. Hist.,' chap. xv.

religious problem inherited from the Reformation, retaining the political safeguards of the National Church, and yet ceasing to proscribe its rivals. The summoning of Convocation, after so many years of practical suppression, showed that William thoroughly understood the importance of the clergy in the Constitution of his new realm; while the withdrawal of the scheme of Comprehension, on which he had set his heart, rather than incur the risk of forcing the mass of the clergy into the Non-juring Schism, showed that he distinctly perceived what was the political influence of the Church. Happily, the clergy, like the nation in general, were on the whole convinced that the Revolution was the only resource from impending ruin, while sufficiently resolved to hold their own to deter the monarch and the Whigs from affronting them. "Thus the Church was saved from a national proscription and from a Latitudinarian manipulation."* The whole treatment of this part of the subject by Hallam, who forgets his usual decorum in his attack on the clergy, is notoriously partial.†

* Perry's 'History of the Church of England since the Reign of Elizabeth,' iii. 137.

† Why is the Lower House of Convocation to be stigmatized as "ill-affected"? Ill-affected to what? Certainly not to the King as King, for it was a party to placing him on the throne; it was "ill-affected" to the King as forcing on the Church the Latitudinarian principles held by a very small minority of its members. With what shadow of fairness can it be said that the deliberations of the Royal Commission of Divines were "doubtless the more honest and rational" for the absence of the "High Church faction" which had seceded from it? This "High Church faction," though it doubtless included some of those who afterwards became Non-jurors, did in reality represent the vast body of the National Church, and William knew it. They were the supporters of Church Nationality. The "Low Church" faction represented the political equality of all reli-

Against him we may quote Lord Macaulay,* who perceives plainly enough that the Church could not have accepted the Comprehension without destroying her own position, and thus depriving the Nation of that guarantee for civil and religious liberty which it possesses in the Establishment.

The suspension of Convocation which ensued on the failure of this attempt to dilute and change the character of the Church, though perhaps necessary for the success of the Revolution, had the same effect as in the previous reigns. The clergy did not work with the Government. They were more dangerous as they were driven in upon themselves, and brooded over the Jacobite principles which were still so powerfully represented in the country. The loss of the Non-jurors was all but irreparable. The Church staggered beneath the stroke. The state of society deteriorated as the principles which had kept it together were loosened. These were now more vigorously attacked and less forcibly defended. A decided moral retrogression had set in. If religion without morality is hypocrisy, a popular morality without religion is a simple impossibility. Happily this was well known to some good men who did not despair of their country. They knew that there was deep religious sentiment left in the country, if it were only evoked and organized. Just as things seemed at their worst, they succeeded in awakening this religious life. They taught the nation to see that everything

gions. Nowadays the terms (invented in the days of which we are speaking) represent a very different thing. They indicate only doctrinal differences, often exaggerated by party spirit and by the tendency of ardent men on both sides to fly off into extremes. The two meanings must not be confused.

* 'History of England,' vol. v. p. 122.

would be lost while they were disputing over the Oath of Allegiance. They formed themselves into Societies of various kinds for the purpose of stemming the tide of general corruption. Voluntary societies sprang up for the reformation of manners, for the education of the people, for promoting Christian Knowledge, for the Propagation of the Gospel; societies some of which, existing to this day, have united that age with our own by links of gold. William and Mary powerfully promoted these noble efforts. Finding his plans for widening the Church and absorbing the Dissenters to be impracticable, the King did his best to support what he saw, with his accustomed sagacity, to be the true safeguard of the common weal.

But renewed activity within the Church, proving itself successful in coping with the evil of the times, soon produced activity of the corporate body. As men felt the stirring of spiritual life, they evinced more zeal in defending what they felt to be right. Controversy set in. Fearing its effects the King stepped in with proclamations to stop it, but this Byzantine or Papal way of dealing with the subject could scarcely stand. The incongruity of such a mode of Church government could hardly fail to strike those whose ancient institutions, guaranteed to them by Crown and Parliament, were provided for the very purpose of self-government. The Tory party, which on the whole had been favoured by the King quite as much as the Whig, took up the cause of freedom. It represented the feeling of the Nation on this point; public opinion soon began to make itself felt,—one of the first and best products of a press recently unfettered; and the King wisely listened to the advice of his Ministers. Convocation

was revived, and the connection of Religion and Politics was once more signalized by the steady beating of the national pulse. The Jacobite sympathies which lent acrimony to the Clerical Parliament when it met might be objected against the policy of summoning it; but it must be observed that the agitation was equally perceptible in Parliament itself. The clergy naturally relinquished more slowly than laymen their sympathy with the House that had favoured them, but the heaving of the sea after the gale was, after all, a slight inconvenience. The disquiet produced by a few ardent men was a small price to pay for the one only Revolution of such a magnitude in the history of the world accomplished without blood. In free countries there must be an outlet. If government is on the whole secure, there can be no greater mark of shortsightedness than to close the vent by which ill humours may escape.

The reign of Anne brings out the connection of which we have been speaking more plainly still. The last years of William III. had prepared the nation for its development, and the accession to the throne of a hearty English Churchwoman gave it an immense impulse. Never, even in the Reformation era itself, were the springs of Political movements more palpably traceable to the influences of Religion.

Few reigns have been so little elucidated by the pen of philosophical history as that of the "good" Queen Anne.* An unjust depreciation of this Sovereign has surely too long been allowed to pass current. A sweeping accusation of feebleness and bigotry is easily caught by one writer from another in an age when bigotry, not

* This reproach is about to be wiped away. Lord Stanhope has announced a History of the reign.

unaccompanied by feebleness, is too generally found in the literature which professes to be most free from it. Her "feebleness" seems chiefly to resolve itself into a habit of taking counsel with female favourites. This, no doubt, was not the sign of a strong mind; but, though more constant, it was not worse in itself, or so bad for the nation, as the able William being swayed by Dutchmen, or George I. and II. by their mistresses. If Elizabeth stands out in vivid contrast with Anne, the Nation might after all prefer the clever, imperious Duchess of Marlborough, or the intriguing Masham, to the corrupt and wicked Leicester. It certainly loved the domestic purity of the feminine wife better than the indecent flirtations of the masculine virgin. Never were the English people more prosperous, more satiated with glory. But then, though she did not by any means commit herself to one party alone, she was, no doubt, a Tory at heart, and she was bigot enough to have, as the Duchess of Marlborough says, "a passion for what she called the Church"*—quite sufficient crimes! There was at least this difference between her favouritism and that of other monarchs. The Queen did not seek these companions for the mere promotion of her whims and pleasures. Candour will admit that she was exceedingly attentive to public business; that she effectually governed the country at a most difficult period, and that too in the old sense of governing, by her own personal exercise of power; and above all, that she possessed that clear perception of what her people wanted, that instinct or intuition, often more developed in women than men, which made her defy obstacles in order to attain the end which she knew

* 'Conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough,' vol. i. p. 6.

would some day be regarded as wise and good. She was, in short, more guided by her conscience than any of our Sovereigns, except one or two. It was no idle boast that she made when she addressed her Parliament for the first time, "My heart is entirely English."* That people had borne with William for the sake of a great object. They had no liking for the Dutch, and a very particular dislike to a break in the Succession; but they submitted to necessity, and received his growing Anglicanism with gratitude as something they had no right to expect. Now, however, they had a Sovereign of the old English Stuart blood, yet honest and hearty in their own religion, born and bred amongst them, yet free from the vices which had so painfully tried their loyalty.†

The first Parliament of Anne, not unaptly nicknamed the Highflyer, represented to the utmost degree the affection for Church and Queen. The reign opened like that of Charles II. The Church party was once more supreme. But the Queen's attachment to Marlborough and his celebrated wife gradually

* 'Burnet's Hist. of His Own Time,' vol. v. p. 3, Oxford Edition. Scotland was not yet united to England, and no Bute was at hand to change "English" into "British." When the Union took place, Swift wrote:

"The Queen has lately lost a part
Of her 'entirely English' heart."

† It has been well said of Anne that "her conduct as a wife and mother was exemplary; her court at once elegant, refined, and virtuous; her charities munificent. Her reign has this happy distinction from all preceding ones, that in it no arm was raised against the Sovereign, and no subject's blood was shed for treason."—'Annals of England,' iii. 174. Swift who, but for Queen Anne, would certainly have been a Bishop, speaks of her in his Will, dated 1737, as "the real nursing-mother of her kingdoms."—'Scott's Swift's Works,' vol. i. p. cxxxiv., Appendix.

led her into the arms of the Whigs, not in consequence of any alienation from the Church, but in connection with the war-policy which had been inherited from William and become the property of that party. The disappointment natural to men who had lost power so rapidly and, as it seemed, undeservedly, shewed itself in a political violence which again reminds us of the period succeeding the Restoration; while the final triumph of the party towards the close of the reign similarly proved how widely and deeply the Nation was imbued with their sentiments. It was now that the famous cry was first heard, "The Church in danger." No doubt this was in some respects a mere "cry." No doubt all such general sentiments, when taken up by a multitude of people religious and irreligious, are chargeable with hypocrisy and open to ridicule. But it is possible to be too wise in these matters. Some of the leading actors on the scene may be stripped bare and detected, but when a "cry" arouses a nation there is always something behind, something, linked on to the past and pointing to the future, which deserves respect and demands inquiry. Not that, as we have already seen, the doctrines of Divine Right and Passive Obedience, which now again found audacious expression, could be justified, but the true meaning of the recurrence to these doctrines was not at this time what the words expressed. It meant that the Nation believed the Queen to be overborne by her counsellors, and, knowing what Constitutional power was still left in the Crown, resolved to engage that power in the support of the cause which it believed to be endangered.

This complicated struggle will become clearer if we recount the steps by which parties had arrived at their

present condition. The Revolution had endowed the Whigs with an enormous power. The Tories, at the critical moment, had actively, but soon only passively and sullenly, supported the movement, leaving the Whigs to usurp all the credit which they might fairly have claimed to share. As William's reign proceeded, the Whig party gained consistency and experience. Political opposition to the Tories or High Church party had thrown them entirely into the Low Church, Dissenting and Latitudinarian interest. But this was rather a busy, intellectual, and active interest, than one which extended very deeply or widely. So that when the mass of the people were once aroused, the effect of their old indignation at the long suppression of so-called "High Church" principles during the greater part of William's reign, and their proportionate delight at the Tory resumption of power, laid them open to a severe shock when, in the reign of the Queen from whom they expected so much, disappointment came, a shock which operated over a very large area, and consequently exhibited itself in a very tumultuous manner. Hence the bitterness of feeling now shown at the dismissal of the Tory Ministry, at the repression of the High Church Clergy of Convocation, and against the tyrannical hand stretched over the Church by the Whig Bishops who had been so liberally imposed upon it by King William. To bring the nation into an acutely inflammatory state it only required the further alarm produced by the Union with Scotland, which it was foreseen would vastly strengthen the Presbyterian interest, and the unpopularity of war-taxes which no intoxication of glory could make the people forget. Hence the fury which burst forth when the spark was applied; for the trial of

Sacheverell was but a trifle in itself, and wholly inadequate to account for the agitation displayed. Hence the "ill-temper" which so distressed the Queen, who had never given any real cause for suspicion of her attachment to the Church, and who sympathized most heartily with her Parliament when it voted by large majorities in both Houses that "the Church is not in danger."

The Whigs, however, were not to be outdone in violence. They made it *penal to say that the Church was in danger.* This violence, and their folly in setting fire to such combustible material by the trial of a man who has been ever since equally condemned by both sides, cost them their short-lived power and changed the face of Europe. If we are to assign any single cause,—which is, surely, to take a superficial view of the subject,—to the blunder of the Whigs must the mighty issue be credited, rather than, as pronounced by Hallam and Macaulay, to Mrs. Masham.

The Queen herself gradually discovered the meaning of the "cry." It struck a chord which, during the thunders of the French war, had been little heeded. She recognized in this "cry" the same overpowering voice of the Nation which, in her father's reign, had backed up the Bishops and the Universities, the voice which, when once raised, had always been powerful enough to make the Church's opponents shrink into insignificance. She took her line. Soon, with consummate management, under Harley's advice, the Whig Ministers were one by one dismissed. Soon follows the great and victorious General himself; (of course, no one can praise the agents or admire the circumstances of the hero's disgrace); a Tory Ministry finds itself once more at the head of affairs; and the Peace of Utrecht,

the last European settlement before that of our own day in which England took an important part, was brought about under the direction of the Queen herself, supported by her new Ministers, and backed up by the great bulk of the Nation.

So intimately was the Peace of Utrecht mixed up with the question we are considering, that a few words upon the causes which produced it will be rather an apparent than a real digression. No Treaty this country has ever made has excited anything like the same amount of controversy. At the time every literary device was brought to bear upon it, and the greatest authorities were drawn up on opposite sides. It has been much the same ever since. Amongst the best known moderns we find Hallam and Lord Stanhope on one side, Lord Macaulay on the other.

The Peace of Utrecht, was in the first place, a National movement,—not a mere shuffle of cards by politicians, the superficial aspect under which it is too generally regarded. Next, it was the termination, not so much of a particular French war, as of a series. Many cobwebs will be swept away by bearing in mind these two considerations.

The National indignation at the disgraceful, un-English policy of Charles II. and James II. (itself the result of the foreign education of those princes consequent on the Civil War) had found a representative in William III. Had that prince been more successful in his heroic efforts to stem the tide of French aggrandizement, the numerous grounds of his unpopularity in England would perhaps have been forgotten. As it was, the Tory feeling of the nation on ecclesiastical and political matters chimed in very naturally with disgust

at his ill success and the expense of his wars. By concessions to the Toryism of the nation he had once more combined all parties on a war policy. At that very moment he died. The brilliant success of Marlborough and the popularity of the Queen kept the nation for some years steady in the same track. But it was, as we have said, a Whig war after all. William and his Whig Ministers had fostered it; Marlborough could only obtain his supplies by the help of a Whig Ministry. The seeds of a speedy change were thus self-contained in the war. They were fast ripening under the uneasy feeling produced, not only by war-taxes, but by the unreadiness to believe in the honesty of the new system, imported from Holland, of making posterity pay for present deficiencies. A National Debt was a new and a suspicious thing to Englishmen. We have noticed the ecclesiastical discontents of the people, and the burst of Toryism produced by the trial of Sacheverell. This was immediately followed by the great change in European affairs effected by the death of the Emperor, yet accompanied by no change of policy in the measures of the war-party. Thus it is easy to account for the sudden and violent turn of the whole tide of national feeling towards peace. The people had been drunk with the glory of Blenheim and Ramillies, Oudenarde and Malplaquet. Sober thought had now convinced the thoughtful, passion the thoughtless, that the time had come to put an end to the war. Their eyes had been opened to the way in which they had been (to use the phrase of the day) "bubbled" by their allies. They learned, under the influence of the ablest political writers this country has ever seen, to suspect their heroes, and, with the ingratitude of mobs, to turn their indignation upon those

who had only yesterday been lauded to the skies. Hence the Peace of Utrecht. It was a National movement. The extreme difficulty of giving effect to it is the only excuse for the tortuous and unsatisfactory means employed. Surely it is a mistake to ascribe these changes to particular men or women. They are the result of a complication of causes acting upon the masses, and backing up the agents who are supposed,—and that not by the vulgar alone—to be pulling the strings. These Harleys and St. Johns and Mrs. Mashams are but the exponents and representatives of the National Will.

The reaction which followed this National movement is even more important in its effect on the destinies of England than the movement itself; for we owe to it the peaceable establishment of the House of Hanover, and the preservation of the Whigs from the political extinction which appeared imminent. Let us again attempt to sum up the causes of a remarkable phenomenon.

We have seen how and why the Nation had desired war, why it quarrelled with those who gave it its wish, and unprecedented glory to boot, and why it desired peace. The glory had come from the wrong quarter, and with very disagreeable accompaniments. The Peace was gained, but how? It had come from the right hands, but in the wrong way. The disclosures which followed that network of intrigue shocked and irritated the people. The old war-fever had not quite died out. The hated French who had been so beaten seemed to have come off too well. The national character had suffered on the Continent, especially by our desertion of the gallant Catalans. Shame seized the nation for its treatment of Marlborough. "A plague o' both your houses," men muttered between their teeth. And now a

new element of confusion intervened. The Queen was about to die. The Tory party was divided. The great mass acted in the same way as at the Revolution, and showed that it valued the Protestantism of Church and State even higher than a continuance of the dynasty with which it sympathized. A smaller section intrigued with the Pretender, though even that, at least the greater part of it, if we may take Bolingbroke at this period as its exponent, only on the condition that he should change his religion.

In exact proportion to the paralysing effect of these conflicting sentiments on the part of the Tories was the strength and consistency gained by the Whigs. No such entanglements hampered them. Their policy was clear. They saw they had only to act with promptitude; there could be no united resistance; the victory was theirs, it might be for ever. The clever movement of Shrewsbury, Somerset and Argyle, was successful simply because the Nation saw it had no choice. Hence its sullen acquiescence in the Hanoverian Succession. Hence its indifference to the fate of the Tory leaders. The good sense of the people perceived that if the very existence of the Established Church was to be preserved, the political degradation of the High Churchmen must be permitted. Their sympathies were with them in their affection for the Stuarts, and especially for the good Queen, but they dared not back them up. They saw that the Church could not be safe under the Pretender. They had borne with William and his Dutchmen, and they would bear with George and his Germans, rather than once more be the victims of Jesuits or plunged into Civil War. They would swallow the inbred Lutheranism of one who only conformed to the

Church of England on becoming king; they would suffer that party to be triumphant which had uniformly patronized Dissenters and adopted the policy of keeping religious questions wholly subordinate in matters of State, rather than endanger what was essential to the good of the nation. "Protestantism, and freedom from French dictation before all things," was still the conviction, the common sense at bottom of the English mind.

But the struggle it had cost to acquiesce in this Settlement of the Crown was plainly visible when the Rebellion of 1715 took place, in the supine, passive position taken up by the people of England,—not in one place or another, but throughout the land. It was visible when crowds attended Atterbury to the shore upon his banishment. It found frequent expression during the next half century. It suggested sufficient danger to Whig ministers to make them seize the earliest pretext for drowning the voice of the clergy by closing their Convocation. It caused the formation of a settled policy which succeeded for many years in damming up the current of National feeling.

We shall not, therefore, be able to trace during the first two Hanoverian reigns with anything like the same distinctness the connection between the Religious and Political history of England. We have seen the Whig party formed under Charles II., learning its policy under William III., and occasionally practising it under Anne. It now reigns supreme under the next two Kings, distastefully to the Nation, no doubt, but that Nation was exhausted with half a century of struggle, and required half a century of repose. It was content to grow rich and cultivate the arts of peace without any more Continental embroilments than the family of its sullen

choice must inevitably bring with it. It was content to see the National Church protected by the continuance of its legal position, the measures to secure which were but little enforced and not very strenuously opposed. It was the policy of Walpole, who shaped that of his successors, to keep things quiet, and to allow no stirrings of life in the corporate action of the Church, while he bought acquiescence by protecting it. Alien sovereigns, corrupted Parliaments, and a growing moneyed interest, fell in very naturally with this scheme. The Latitudinarian clergy (the name by which they had become known in the reign of Charles II.), brought forward into high places, become dominant. The more decided Churchmen shrink away into the country or vegetate in the Universities, at this time at their lowest ebb. Generations grow up under the new influences. Political vigour decays with that of the Church. Society creeps back into the condition out of which it had been not a little raised at the beginning of the century. Literary and theological controversy,—Deistical, Arian, Socinian,—occupied the foremost Churchmen of the age. The spiritual life of the Church seemed dying out. The Bangorian and Warburtonian controversies were simply degrading. In 1747 even Bishop Butler, thinking it too late to attempt to save the Church of England, refused the Primacy. That Primacy was spoken of by contemporaries as the "richest sinecure in the country." When we at last thought it time to commence a Mission in our conquered Indian territories, we had to go to Germany for missionaries. The orthodoxy of the Church was, however, almost miraculously saved through this time of trial; and its spirituality was gradually to receive an entirely new impulse from a new quarter, the

indirect agency of John Wesley. But the reconstruction of Parties, and thereby the renewed connection between Religion and Politics, was due to one to whom religion certainly owed but little during his life, and who little understood what he was about to do for it after his death.

The posthumous works of Lord Bolingbroke came out in 1753 and the next year. Johnson has immortalized the act of the man who left half-a-crown to a beggarly Scotchman to fire off the blunderbuss he was afraid to fire himself. His mischievous philosophy has justly prejudiced posterity against him, but the importance of his political works has scarcely been sufficiently recognized either by politicians or Church writers.* During the last years of the reign of George II. his writings were in every hand, and made an indelible mark. His hatred of the Whigs, and especially of Walpole,—who, from a well-founded dread of Bolingbroke's abilities, had assiduously blocked up every avenue by which he could return to power,—turned the fretful leisure of this most gifted man into an opportunity for reconsidering the whole question of Party-government, and reconstructing a basis on which it might afterwards be worked. It was his to place before his countrymen, with all the recommendations of style and personal experience of politics, the true political history of the better ages of England, to apply the lessons of the past to the present, to point out the place of the Church in the Constitution, to recover for the Tories their proper share in the great Revolution

* To Mr. Disraeli, beyond any other writer, belongs the merit of drawing attention (in his novels and political works) to Bolingbroke's position in English political history.

Settlement, to prove that Jacobitism was a mere excrescence of their system, and that they were as much obliged to support the Hanoverian House as the Whigs, to show that they had really represented the Nation when most taunted with being partisans, and that to them had been especially due some of the greatest political benefits the country had received. In the mind of many a leading statesman, as the reign of George III. advanced, we may see the leaven of this political teaching at work, but nowhere more than in that of the youthful monarch himself, whose boyhood had ripened into manhood under the influences of the author of 'The Patriot King.'

It would be out of place here to enter into any detailed criticism of the political teaching of that work. Some of it is mere chimera. For a King to govern in a free country without Party is a simple contradiction of terms. But the great truths contained in 'The Patriot King,' that there was much really in common between the two great parties, that their common basis of agreement had been for many years obscured under the corrupt, unchallenged dominion of one party alone, and that it was the province of the Crown to see that its Constitutional place was not destroyed by a Whig oligarchy, were pregnant with future life. The crude notions with which the earnest young King started forth in quest of this ideal led him and the country through many bitter passages, but the end was substantially attained. By the long-unwonted exertion of royal power the oligarchy was broken up. The long-crushed Tory party, its old stain of Jacobitism now worn out, was reanimated. The long-dormant, wholesome action of party-warfare was developed. The Church again showed

signs of life; and when the Whigs once more, rallying the Romanists and Dissenters round their standard, attacked her political position, she found her interests adopted as of old by the Tories.

Thus we find the Nation, by the time the King has reigned some fifteen years, completely in the old track. While Religion was half-dead, the connection between it and Politics was untraceable. It had taken some years to break through the barriers so carefully reared against the ancient alliance; but we now observe the connection as strongly developed as ever. The old feeling of national loyalty to Church and King might now be indulged by men without any dread of being entrapped into unpatriotic courses; and the greatest statesmen England has ever seen were ranked together in defence of the old institutions. The cry of "Church in danger" was more than once raised during this long reign, and, as of old, never failed to rally the Nation to the defence. Pitt, Burke, and Wilberforce, the ablest, the wisest, and the best men of their day, joined in resisting the Abolition of the Test Acts. Theoretically, the Church should have been independent of such enactments, which were questionable enough when made, but, practically, the times were by no means propitious for the change.*

* In the great debate which took place on Fox's motion, Pitt said, "A repeal of the Test laws could not take place consistently with safety to the Church." Burke declared that "a variety of circumstances made it appear imprudent to meddle with it." Wilberforce that "it was his firm conviction that the establishment of religion would be endangered by granting the Dissenters' request."—'Parliamentary History,' vol. xxviii. Pitt also said: "So far was he from agreeing with the Right Honourable gentleman (Mr. Fox), that no danger whatsoever was to be apprehended, that he could easily conceive a man with all the abilities of the Right Honourable gentle-

The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was thrown back for a whole generation by the No-Popery Riots and the French Revolution. The former of these are more suggestive upon the subject of which we are treating than might be supposed. They are generally regarded as unmitigated examples of the folly of a crack-brained nobleman and the brutality of mobs. But Lord Stanhope pronounces that, while we deplore the excesses into which they ran, "we may be willing to acknowledge that they proceeded from a just attachment to the Reformed Faith and Established Churches of the country."* There is no doubt that, however shocking the effect of the demonstration, these Riots did in fact represent in their wild way the same instinctive dread of Romanism, and distrust in the statesmanship which was once more bringing it back to political power, as was witnessed in the reign of Charles II. In a country which can never forget the reigns of Mary and James II., such instinctive dread is at least natural. They did not, however, represent the mere dread of Popery, not the old Lollard and Puritan feeling which we have seen running in its own special stream of Nonconformity and Dissent, not the jealousy and dislike of the National Church, but the dread of seeing Romanism set up in a position of political equality with the Establishments of England and Scotland, the conviction that civil and

man, but without the integrity of his principle, who, influenced by ambitious and corrupt views, might exercise his powerful talents in rousing the disaffected to an attack upon the Church."—Ibid., p. 414. Fox, in his opening speech, committed himself to a rash prophecy:—"If the Test Laws were once repealed, the very name of Dissenter would be no more."—Ibid. p. 402.

* 'History of England,' vol. vi., p. 240.

religious liberty could only be secured by its exclusion. Hence these Riots illustrate another characteristic of English party history. They furnish one more in addition to the other numerous instances of the disturbing force by which the Whig party has, ever since its formation, been so cruelly torn. In order to balance the party of Church and State, Church and King, or whatever the formula by which the English Nation has for the time been rallied round the Tory party, they have called in the aid of Scotland and Ireland, of Nonconformists and Romanists. But no sooner have their forces been marshalled than its different squadrons have begun to attack one another. The opposition to the relief of Romanists came in this instance first from Scotch Presbyterians, and soon gathered up those lower sections of the Whig party whose Protestantism was stronger than party ties. United with the party of the Church the movement becomes irresistible, and all progress towards political enfranchisement is suspended till some fresh opportunity occurs.

The French Revolution only clinched the feeling of the Nation. It had begun to discern more and more plainly that in the Church it had the barrier so much needed at the most critical period England had yet experienced, against the two ancient enemies, Roman and French influences. In the revival of the old instinct of Loyalty and Religion, it found itself strong enough not only to suppress Anarchy at home, but to strike down the Scourge of Europe abroad.

No investigation could be more in keeping with the subject of this Lecture than that of the process by which the Church became fitted for the great work thus designed for it in the latter part of the last century.

We might trace in detail the growth of that better spirit by which it gradually emerged out of the position of a body supported by authority, protected by enactments, holding its own rather by custom and tradition than affection, and accepted rather as a refuge from something hateful than from any higher feeling, into a living power of which the nation felt secure and proud, and under whose banners the more respectable politicians of both parties were after a time content to fight; but we must sum it up in a quotation from Lord Stanhope. "The reflecting few," says he, "could perceive (in the earlier Hanoverian period) that the Church of England, though pure as ever in doctrine, was impaired in energy, and must have either help or opposition to stir it. That impulse was in a great measure given by the Methodists. The clergy caught their spirit, but refined it from the alloy of enthusiasm. The discipline of the Church was gradually revived, and its deficiencies supplied. Every year the Establishment rose higher and higher in efficiency and usefulness; and it has checked and arrested the progress of the Methodists, not so much by their faults as its own merits. At no period had it lost its hold upon the great body of the people; but it now struck still deeper root into their hearts—roots of which the unconquerable strength will be found if ever an attempt be made to pluck it out." *

And here we leave the subject. It will be best not to follow the connection of Religion and Politics into the present century. Let us conclude by pointing out that before every recurring phase of the renewed Connection which we have traced, there has been a period of disaster and depression, a torpid vitality amongst the

* 'Hist. of Eng.,' ii. 248.

clergy, an abundant crop of abuses in Church matters, accompanied by a decay of morals in the nation, and generally by a sense of degradation in the relative position of England towards other nations. The renewed political life, the life of a wholesome party conflict,—for it has ever been useful to the Church that a strong political party should be allied with its enemies,—has been ushered in by a renewed Church life, by the going forth of the Church into the dark places of the land and making sacrifices for the good of the people. The great Societies which remain as landmarks of these movements, long after the movements have themselves been forgotten, the landmarks of the reigns of William III., of Anne, and of George III., the churches and parsonages which have been built and restored, the vast educational efforts of Churchmen, the steadily increasing spirit of missionary enterprise, and the social improvements in all classes, have sprung from the growth of earnest religion in the case of individuals who have not, in the darkest times, despaired of their Church and country, and who have devoted themselves to the propagation of their own warmth with a truly public spirit. The sense of renewed life in the Church thus awakened, the zeal of the people has been stirred up in its defence. Political combinations have been the natural, the legitimate, nay, in a free country, the only means of organising that defence. The Church and the Nation have each found its account in the connection. Each has suffered when the connection has been weakened. Each would have gained far more than it has, had the proper terms of that connection been sufficiently recognised.*

* See Lectures III. and IV.

Whenever the connection between the Church and the Nation has been misunderstood or overstrained; as, for example, when the Constitution, in the reigns of James I. and Charles I., was seriously endangered; when the arrogance of political power, as in the reign of Charles II., has sapped the National respect for the Church; when Churchmen have lost sight of the welfare of the Nation in a sentimental affection, however honourable, for a particular family, as in the case of Jacobitism; when controversy, often necessarily prominent in the defence of truth, and as such a sign of healthy life, has become the one marked and leading feature of the Church, as in the earlier Hanoverian reigns, the time for the enemies of the Church has arrived. They do not find it difficult to collect the old weapons. It may have cost ages of labour to build up a religious fabric: there are plenty of avenues by which it can be attacked, and, perhaps, in any particular nation, destroyed. Whatever appeals to Faith, to the Unseen, can always be appealed against by the votaries of Sense and the slaves of Materialism. The progress of knowledge will always supply means of offence, especially during the earlier stages of such progress, when its heralds are led into mistakes from immature inductions; and the power exerted by such influences forms the ever-ready basis of opposition for the hostile ranks openly confronting the Church.* That Church must always, by its

* A late writer previously quoted, though by no means regarding the Church as the one commissioned teacher of the nation, expresses himself very clearly on the prospects of creedless intelligence. "Nor is there anything in modern intelligence, if what is Christian in it were taken out of it, that could ensure us against the lapse of Europe into its old Paganism, or into forms of heathenism which would be very near akin to it."—'Vaughan's Revolutions of History,' iii. 646.

very charter, be in its spiritual capacity a Church Militant. In our country it has been, from its continued Nationality through so many ages, a political power also, and in that sense too a Church Militant. It is easy for friends to depict its part in this struggle too favourably, for enemies too unfavourably. Party spirit sees such things through its own coloured spectacles. We have here only to do with facts. We have been regarding a chequered history, but its good and evil are only a faithful transcript and outcome of human nature itself. At any rate it is the history of England, the history of that English people who have certainly not effected the least of any people for politics, religion, war, science, art, literature. If religious influences and passions, if, distinguished above all such influences, the Church of the Nation has played a conspicuous part in that history; if the connection of that Church with our Political and Constitutional Progress has been constant and powerful, it certainly cannot be a thing to be sneered down by "philosophers," whether historians or others.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, DUKE STREET, STAMFORD STREET
AND CHARING CROSS.

00027395

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 25 June, 2016